DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 201 652 TM 810 232

AUTHOR	Jones, Earl; And Others
TITLE	Evaluation of California's Educational Services to Limited and Non-English Speaking Students: Volume III: Technical Materials, Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Development Associates, Inc., San Francisco, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	California State Legislature, Sacramento. Office of the Legislative Analyst.
PUB DATE	Dec 80
CONTRACT	JLBC-78-1
NOTE	270p.; See TM 810 230 for Volume I, Final Report and TM 810 231 for Volume II: Executive Summary, Final Report.
AVAILABLE FROM	Development Associates, 693 Sutter St., 3rd Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102 ($12.00 per copy).
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Ability Identification; Academic Achievement; Administrator Attitudes; *Bilingual Education; *Educational Assessment; Educational Finance; Elementary Secondary Education; *Non English Speaking; Parent Attitudes; Participant Satisfaction; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Program Implementation; *Questionnaires; Research Design; State Programs; Student Attitudes; Student Placement; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS	*California; *Limited English Speaking

ABSTRACT

Designed to assist California policy and decision makers with planning to meet the future educational needs of limited-English speaking (LES) and non-English speaking (NES) students, this study was undertaken: (1) to describe and analyze the implementation of all areas of the legislatively required services to LES/NES children, and the structures which support those services, particularly in terms of instructional strategies, financial resources and utilization, teacher preparation, and district policies; (2) to relate these implementation factors with measures of program effectiveness through analysis of student achievement and the satisfaction of students, parents, teachers, aides, and administrators with the bilingual instructional services, and thus determine the relationship between program implementation and impact on children and others involved in the program; and (3) to analyze procedures for the state and local language census of LES/NES children and examine the instruments used for placement, including the materials and procedures used to train test administrators and in the reporting of results. Volume I of this final report contains the full narrative and the more important tables. Volume II is the Executive Summary. This Volume contains the instruments, some technical explanatory materials, and many of the complex tables not included in Volume I. (Author/RL)

DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

MANAGEMENT AND GOVERNMENTAL CONSULTANTS

693 SUTTER STREET, THIRD FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102
415/ 776-0120

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED201652

EVALUATION OF CALIFORNIA'S EDUCATIONAL SERVICES TO LIMITED AND NON-ENGLISH SPEAKING STUDENTS

Volume III: Technical Materials

Final Report

©

Contract No. JLBC-78-1

December 1980

by

Earl Jones
Eliodoro G. Robles
Adolfo Munoz
Sarah Berkowitz

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E. Jones

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Submitted to:

Office of the Legislative Analyst
California State Legislature
Sacramento, California

Submitted by:

Development Associates, Inc.
693 Sutter Street, Third Floor
San Francisco, California 94102

TM 810 a32

ARLINGTON – 2924 COLUMBIA PIKE, ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22204 Cable Address: DAWASH 703/979-0100
ALBUQUERQUE – P.O. BOX 2128, 125 SECOND STREET, NW, ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO 87101 505/243-3537
DENVER – 1649 DOWNING STREET, DENVER, COLORADO 80218 303/831-0303
PHILADELPHIA – 1423A ROLLING GLEN DRIVE, BOOTHWYN, PENNSYLVANIA 19061 215/485-7959
WASHINGTON, D.C. – 1756 COLUMBIA ROAD, NW, 2ND FLOOR, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009 202/387-2090

COLOMBIA – APARTADO AEREO 90260, BOGOTA, COLOMBIA, SOUTH AMERICA 271-0879
EL SALVADOR – APARTADO POSTAL 01-286, SAN SALVADOR, EL SALVADOR, CENTRAL AMERICA 503/22-5723
PHILIPPINES – 161 ROXAS BLVD., #304, BACLARAN, METRO MANILA, PHILIPPINES 011/63-2-828-73-46

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Development Associates is indebted to many staff members of the sample school districts, students, parents, and community members for their cooperation in, and providing data for, this three year study. The guarantees of anonymity for the respondents prevent naming them but without their support, completion of the study would not have been accomplished. Similarly, staff members of many institutions gave guidance and furnished information: the several offices of the State Department of Education, many organizations of the Legislature, county and consortium education agencies, federal projects, and universities. While the number of persons is too extensive for inclusion herein, their assistance is gratefully acknowledged.

Development Associates also wants to recognize the guidance and help provided by the Advisory Committee set up for this research:

Henry J. Dalton, Fontana Unified School District, Fontana California
William Harvey, East Texas State University, Commerce, Texas
Marie Lee, Kai Ming Head Start, San Francisco, California
Charles Leyba, California State University at Los Angeles
Esther Tanori, San Jose County Advisory Committee, San Jose, California

Additionally, the technical consultants from the California government agencies in Sacramento contributed important information, suggestions, and assistance in the formulation and conduct of several portions of the study. The final composition of the consultant team included:

Alicia Bugurian, Department of Finance
James Browne, Senate Education Committee
Tom Burns, Assembly Ways and Means Committee
Robert A. Cervantes, Office of Bilingual Bicultural Education, State Department of Education
David Gordon, Office of Planning Research and Evaluation, State Department of Education
Guillermo Lopez, Office of Bilingual Bicultural Education, State Department of Education
Rita Mize, Assembly Office of Research
James Murdock, Assembly Education Committee

Further, through the three years, many other consultants from the agencies assisted for shorter periods: Joan Bissell, Janet Denton, Gail Evans, Ann Frentz, David Jolly, T. Patrick Keegan, Cathy Minicucci, John McCoy, Gregg Geeting, and David Sweet. The reviews and suggestions by government consultants are sincerely appreciated.

Special technical consulting was provided at important junctures of the research: William Theimer, Jr., Rodney Skager, Henry Torres Trueba, Richard Shavelson, James Fulton, Roy Gabriel, and William Padia. Without their expertise, the precision of the work would have been diminished. Important, too, were those consultants who lent their language skills to the work: Harry Bang, George Hsu, Eleanor H. Jones, Chuong Le, Anahid Hasmig Tashjian, and Stanton Tong. Robert Gilbert and Ken Kimbrow furnished expert assistance with the finance portions of the study. Thomas R. Dayton, Leticia Diaz-Sanchez, and Juliana D. Rodrigues contributed significantly to the research through their careful data collection. Tom O'Toole, director of the computer center at San Francisco State University, facilitated the arrangements for the use of the system. Special appreciation is noted for William Lautenberger, San Francisco State University, for his technical assistance at the computer center and his hard work on the statistical analyses.

Many Development Associates staff members conducted portions of the data collection and helped with the technical designs: Masako Tanaka, Joann Fiesel, Maritza B. Macdonald, Luis A Hernandez, Tony Colon, Barry Wardlaw, Monica Scott, and Marlene Bernstein from the San Francisco office, and Ed Cervenka and Milton Goldsamt from the Arlington, Virginia, office. Robert Ferrell carried out many data storage and other management functions. Judith Earley provided much of the editing and report preparation work.

Finally, but most important of all, the two project officers for this study are recognized for their sincere concern, efforts to facilitate the work, and direct assistance with every phase of the study:

Rudolph S. Marshall
David Walrath

These officers, both on the staff of the Office of the Legislative Analyst, guided the research from its beginnings to its conclusion.

* * * * *

The work reported herein was carried out under contract to the Office of the Legislative Analyst, California Legislature, through Assembly Bill 65 funds. The results included and the conclusions reached are those of the researchers and do not necessarily reflect the opinions or policies of the school districts, or of the several California government agencies involved. No official endorsement should be implied.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENT	i
PREFACE	1
RESEARCH DESIGN	3
Summary of Data Collection Methods in Examination of Implementation Characteristics and Financial Resources	4
Spring 1977 State Census Results for LES/NES Students in the Public Schools	5
HOME LANGUAGE SURVEY	6
Recommended Version for the Han Languages of China	7
TABLES FROM THE SATISFACTION STUDY	9
Frequencies of Respondents by Sample Site and Type	10
Frequencies of Respondents by Program and Type	12
Languages and Language Groups of the Satisfaction Respondents	13
Frequencies of Sample Respondents by First Language Group and Type	14
Summary of General School Satisfaction Ratings by Type of Respondent and Respondent Characteristic	15
Distribution of Ratings for General School Satisfaction	16
Summary of the Ratings on the Importance of Speaking Two or More Languages	17
Distribution of Ratings on the Importance of Speaking Two or More Languages	18
Summary of the Ratings on the Bilingual Legislation	19
Distribution of Ratings of the Bilingual Education Legislation	20
Summary of the Ratings of the Children's Progress in the Classes	21
Distribution of Ratings on Pupil Progress in the Classes	22
Summary of the Respondent Ratings on the Way the Classes are Taught	23
Distribution of the Ratings on How the Classes are Taught	24

Section	Page
Summary of the Respondent Ratings of the Teaching of Cultures	25
Distribution of the Ratings on the Teaching of Cultures	26
Summary of the Respondent Ratings on Community Participation	27
Distribution of the Ratings on Community Participation in the Programs	28
Summary of the Preferences for the Period of Program Enrollment	29
Distribution of the Preferences for the Period of Program Enrollment	30
Summary of the Respondent Preferences for the Proportion of English to Primary Language	31
Distribution of Preferences for the Proportion of English to Primary Language	32
REVIEW OF TEST SCORE DIFFICULTIES	33
SUPPLEMENTAL TABLES RELATED TO PUPIL ACHIEVEMENT	42
Distribution of Students by First Language/Language Group, Incidence of English Scores, Spanish Scores, and No Scores, and Distribution in Total Sample	43
Mean 1980 English Achievement T-Score by First Language Group and English Fluency	46
ANOVA Summary Table for the 1980 Reading and Mathematics Subtests of the English Achievement Test for the Important Variables	47
Summary Multiple Regression Table for 1980 Reading and Mathematics Achievement by Important Variables: All Students	48
Summary Multiple Regression Table for 1980 Reading and Language Achievement by Important Variables: Limited and Non-English Speaking Pupils Only	49
PROPRIETORY STATEMENT	50
GENERAL INFORMATION INSTRUMENTS	51
Program Identification Guide	52
Program Characteristics Guide	54

Section	Page
GUIDES SPECIFIC TO SAMPLE SCHOOLS	78
LES/NES Services Questionnaire: Administrator	79
LES/NES Services Questionnaire: Teacher	88
LES/NES Services Questionnaire: Aide	90
LES/NES Services Questionnaire: Teacher and Aide	92
Administrator/Advisory Committee Member Opinionnaire	98
LITERATURE REVIEW GUIDES	101
Instructions	102
General Treatises	103
Research/Evaluation Reports	105
Composite Materials	107
SPECIAL DATA GUIDES	109
Interview Lists for Sample Schools	110
Student List for Sample Classes	112
Sample Data Recording Sheet	114
Code Lists for Data Recording Sheets	116
Request for Language Interview Assistance	118
Check List for School Sites	119
CLASSROOM OBSERVATION GUIDE	123
Observation Instrument	124
Instructions	130
SATISFACTION GUIDES	134
Instructions	135
Student (English, Spanish, Tagalog, Ilocano, Japanese, Chinese)	136
Program Parent (English, Spanish, Tagalog, Ilocano, Japanese, Chinese)	149
Community (English)	169
Staff (English)	178

Section	Page
FINANCE STUDY GUIDES	184
District	185
School	189

PREFACE

Development Associates was contracted by the Office of the Legislative Analyst to conduct a three year study into the California services to limited and non-English speaking students. A combination of purposive and random sampling procedures resulted in 10,121 pupils in 276 classrooms, in 74 schools and centers, in 15 districts. The students' characteristics were controlled for English fluency (fluent, limited, non), first language (95 languages grouped into 12 categories), socioeconomic status (low, above), student status (regular, migrant, special education), and grade. English and Spanish (when available) achievement test scores were collected for spring 1978, 1979, and 1980.

The services were studied in several ways:

Language Assessment: Research into some psychometric properties of the Home Language Survey and the dominance instrument entitled Observation Assessment Instrument was conducted. In addition four proficiency tests were surveyed. School staff interviews were used to obtain reactions on these several tests.

Instructional Components Literature: An exhaustive search of the literature on bilingual education, English as a second language, and teaching primary languages was conducted. Data on the effectiveness of the practices were included in the few cases where they were reported. An extensive bibliography was attached.

Pupils, Programs, and Instruction: The distribution of the students according to the previously described characteristics was presented for the entire sample and for the subset that had English and/or Spanish achievement scores. The declared and observed programs in which they were enrolled were also detailed. Finally, via intensive classroom observations, the instructional practices were described.

Satisfaction: Likert scale ratings and open ended questions were used to study the satisfaction with the services on the part of 2,137 respondents: students, program teachers and aides, non-program teachers, resource teachers, administrators, parents, and other community members.

Achievement: English and Spanish achievement was analyzed by comparison with pupil characteristics, programs, and instructional practices to determine those programs and practices that produced differing results.

Auxiliary Services: Teacher and aide experience, preparation, and certification were described. Interim information on program assistance by state and federal agencies, regional organizations, and universities was obtained. Articulation of bilingual education with other school programs was probed.

Finance: State allocations, special district data, and three case studies were utilized to examine the financial resources for services to limited and non-English speaking students.

Three types of reporting were tendered to the Office of the Legislative Analyst:

Conferences with the project officer were held as needed to resolve difficulties and solve problems. The Advisory Committee and Government Consultants group met each year to review the research procedures and interim reports. Specialist panels were enlisted when the need arose.

Five interim reports were presented. Each contained information on the design refinements and the instruments to be administered; the third report included the language assessment substudy, the fourth the instructional components search, and the fifth the satisfaction results. Partial data on programs and finance were included in the last three.

The final report is presented in three volumes, each with different audiences in mind:

> Volume I: Narrative contains the full design and findings with sufficient tables for comparisons with other studies. The materials in the interim reports are included.
>
> Volume II: Executive Summary presents a brief statement on each phase of the work, recommendations, and special policy issues.
>
> Volume III: Technical Materials, the present tome, is only a supplement to the full narrative and of interest primarily to researchers. It contains some complex tables not included in the narrative report, explanations of the test problems, and all of the instruments used during the three years of study.

Brief explanations preface each of the sections in this volume as an orientation to the materials. Researchers must necessarily use the materials in conjunction with the full narrative report, Volume I.

RESEARCH DESIGN

The sources of the data for the entire study are summarized in a format that can be scanned readily in the accompanying figure. Details on the procedures are available in *Interim Reports III, IV,* and *V.* See the instrument section in this volume for the questionnaires, opinionnaires, and other data collection forms.

Several references were made to statewide language distributions in the reports. The 1977 counts are provided in this section for general comparison.

FIGURE I: SUMMARY OF DATA COLLECTION METHODS IN EXAMINATION OF IMPLEMENTATION CHARACTERISTICS AND FINANCIAL RESOURCES

METHODS	PRIMARY SOURCES				SECONDARY SOURCES		
STUDY DIMENSIONS	Interview	Survey	Observation	Classroom Materials	District Reports	District Test Data	Dept. of Ed. Data
1. Educational Services							
Program Identification							
. Goals & Emphases	•		•	•			
. Instructional Strategies	•		•	•			
. Funding Source Program	•				•		•
. Languages	•			•	•		•
Program Articulation							
. Curricula	•		•	•			
. Materials	•		•	•			
. Assessment Of Student Progress	•			•	•	•	
. Exposure	•		•				
. Classroom Composition	•		•	•			
. Instructional Setting			•	•			
. Evaluation	•				•		
District Staffing Patterns	•				•		•
Training For Teachers And Aides	•	•	•				•
Support For Bilingual Education	•	•					
2. Financial Resources							
. Documentation of Financial Resources	•				•		•
. Effects of Changes in State Funding	•	•	•		•		•
. Differences in Resource Types	•		•				•

Spring 1977 State Census Results for LES/NES Students in the Public Schools

Language	NES	LES	TOTAL	%
Spanish	51,878	143,795	195,673	83.82
Vietnamese	523	5,296	5,819	2.49
Chinese*	966	4,734	5,700	2.44
Tagalog	379	5,291	5,670	2.42
Korean	829	3,442	4,271	1.82
Japanese	461	1,571	2,032	0.87
Portuguese	288	1,594	1,882	0.80
Samoan	143	1,009	1,152	0.49
Ilocano	48	871	919	0.39
American Indian	11	207	218	0.09
All Others Combined	1,574	8,534	10,108	4.32
TOTALS	57,100	176,344	233,444	99.95

*Includes Cantonese and Mandarin.

HOME LANGUAGE SURVEY

The experts employed by Development Associates found some small improvements that could be made in the Spanish and Portuguese versions of the Home Language Survey. (See the discussion in *Interim Report III*.) They agreed that the version originally labeled "Pilipino" was in Tagalog, one of the Philippine languages, and recommended that it be labeled as such. An additional version was prepared in Ilocano, another of the Philippine languages.

Recommended Version for the Han Languages of China

The Chinese version was discovered to have two problems. First, it did not provide an opportunity for respondents to state which of the many languages of China they spoke, resulting in a general classification of "Chinese," which is not a language, or Cantonese, even though 25% of the students did not speak that language. The second problem was that of incomplete sentences and the omission of some of the prompting items. Development Associates prepared the revision which follows.

Home Language Survey: Chinese

家庭語言調查表

日期 _____ 學校 _____

教師 _____

加州教育法例規定各學校必須調查各學生在家庭中所用的是何種語言。此項調查非常重要。因為校方需根據此調查為各學生計劃有意義之教導。敬請各位家長合作完成此項調查。

請回答下列各項問題，並將此調查表由貴子女帶交教師。

學生姓名 _____ 年級 _____ 年齡 _____

一. 貴子女初學講話時是用何種語言，_____

二. 現在貴子女在家中最常用何種語言。_____

DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

三. 貴家長经常用何種語言和子女談話?

四. 家中成人之間常用幾種語言. 請依照應用多少的次序排列: 甲 _____

乙 _____

丙 _____

加州教育部

家長或監護人簽名

8 DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

TABLES FROM THE SATISFACTION STUDY

The following tables provide the detailed data on the composition of the samples and the satisfaction distributions and means by:

Respondent type,
First language of respondents,
Number of languages spoken by respondents,
Instructional programs.

These tables were included in *Interim Report V* but excluded from *Volume I: Narrative* of the final report. Some of the information included may be of assistance to some researchers and evaluators for comparisons with other studies. The general findings are described in the final report. Some readers may want to see *Interim Report V* for the discussions relating to specific table items. The several language versions of the instruments used are included in the instrument section of this volume.

Frequencies of Respondents by Sample Site and Type

Site	Total		Student		Program teacher		Aide		Non-Prog teacher		Resource teacher		Administrator		Parent		Community	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	32	1.5	9	2.1	4	1.4	4	1.7	2	1.0	0	0	3	3.1	8	1.4	4	1.8
2	15	0.7	8	1.9	2	1.0	2	0.8	2	1.0	0	0	1	1.0	3	0.5	4	1.8
3	12	0.6	2	0.5	1	0.3	0	0	2	1.0	1	2.5	0	0	6	1.1	2	0.9
4	37	1.8	10	2.4	3	1.0	3	1.3	2	1.0	0	0	3	0.4	10	1.8	8	3.6
5	38	1.8	16	3.8	1	0.3	2	0.8	4	1.9	0	0	1	1.0	10	1.8	4	1.8
6	35	1.7	13	3.1	1	0.3	4	0.8	4	1.9	1	2.5	1	1.0	13	2.3	2	0.9
7	24	1.2	6	1.4	3	1.0	3	1.3	4	1.9	0	0	1	1.9	8	1.4	2	0.9
8*	21	1.0	4	0.9	1	0.3	2	0.8	4	1.9	1	2.5	2	2.1	6	1.1	1	0.5
9	26	1.3	4	0.9	2	0.7	2	0.8	4	1.9	2	5.0	5	5.2	6	1.1	1	0.5
10	47	2.3	10	2.4	6	2.1	9	3.8	4	1.9	1	2.5	1	1.0	10	1.8	6	2.7
11	54	2.6	13	3.1	9	3.1	7	2.9	4	1.9	3	7.5	0	0	17	3.0	4	1.8
12	34	1.6	4	0.9	5	1.7	5	2.1	4	1.9	1	2.5	1	1.0	10	1.8	4	1.8
13	42	2.0	10	2.4	7	2.4	4	1.7	4	1.9	1	2.5	1	1.0	10	1.8	5	2.3
14	41	2.0	6	1.4	7	2.4	7	2.9	2	1.0	0	0	1	1.0	14	2.5	4	1.8
15	32	1.5	8	1.9	4	1.4	3	1.3	3	1.5	2	5.0	1	1.0	7	1.2	4	1.8
16	17	0.8	2	0.5	2	0.7	2	0.8	4	1.9	0	0	1	1.0	2	0.4	4	1.8
17	27	1.3	4	0.9	3	1.0	3	1.3	4	1.9	0	0	1	1.0	9	1.6	3	1.4
18	65	3.1	23	5.4	9	3.1	5	2.1	5	2.4	1	2.5	1	1.0	19	3.4	2	0.9
19	17	0.8	2	0.5	2	0.7	1	0.4	4	1.9	0	0	1	1.0	4	0.7	3	1.4
20	12	0.6	0	0	1	0.3	1	0.4	4	1.9	1	2.5	1	1.0	2	0.4	3	1.4
21	19	0.9	3	0.7	2	0.7	4	1.7	4	1.9	0	0	1	1.0	1	0.2	4	1.8
22	19	0.8	4	0.9	3	1.0	0	0	0	0	1	2.5	1	1.0	6	1.1	4	1.8
23	27	1.3	11	2.6	4	1.4	1	0.4	2	1.0	0	0	1	1.0	6	1.1	4	1.8
24	36	1.7	4	0.9	6	2.1	5	2.1	1	0.5	2	5.0	1	1.0	13	2.3	4	1.8
25	36	1.7	9	2.1	6	2.1	4	1.7	4	1.9	0	0	1	1.0	8	1.4	4	1.8
26*	10	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2.1	4	0.7	4	1.8
27*	10	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.0	5	0.9	4	1.8
28*	9	0.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0.7	5	2.3
29*	8	0.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.0	3	0.5	4	1.8
30*	8	0.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0.7	4	1.8
31*	7	0.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0.5	4	1.8
32*	5	0.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0.5	2	0.9
33*	10	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2.1	4	0.7	4	1.8
34*	31	1.5	0	0	5	1.7	5	2.1	4	1.9	2	5.0	1	1.0	10	1.8	4	1.8
35	42	2.0	12	2.8	6	2.1	4	1.7	4	1.9	0	0	1	1.0	11	2.0	4	1.8
36	43	2.1	6	1.4	6	2.1	7	2.9	4	1.9	3	7.5	1	1.0	13	2.3	3	1.4
37	26	1.3	6	1.4	3	1.0	3	1.3	4	1.9	0	0	2	2.1	3	0.5	4	1.8

Site	Total		Student		Program teacher		Aide		Non-Prog teacher		Resource teacher		Administrator		Parent		Community	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
38	70	3.4	17	4.0	17	5.9	6	2.5	4	1.9	1	2.5	2	2.1	18	3.2	5	2.3
39	35	1.7	10	2.4	5	1.7	4	1.7	4	1.9	1	2.5	2	2.1	7	1.2	2	0.9
40	106	5.1	37	8.7	15	5.2	8	3.4	6	2.9	0	0	1	1.0	35	6.2	4	1.8
41*	28	1.4	4	0.9	5	1.7	5	2.1	4	1.9	0	0	2	2.1	7	1.2	1	0.5
42	53	2.6	8	1.9	9	3.1	10	4.2	4	1.9	0	0	3	3.1	15	2.7	4	1.8
43	20	1.0	1	0.2	6	2.1	6	2.5	4	1.9	0	0	2	2.1	1	0.2	2	0.9
44	23	1.1	4	0.9	3	1.0	2	0.8	4	1.9	0	0	2	2.1	4	0.7	4	1.8
45	33	1.6	6	1.4	8	2.8	7	2.9	2	2.5	0	0	2	2.1	9	1.6	2	0.9
46*	20	1.0	2	0.5	3	1.0	1	0.4	4	1.9	0	0	3	3.1	3	0.5	4	1.8
47	27	1.3	2	0.5	4	1.4	4	1.7	3	1.5	0	0	2	2.1	7	1.2	4	1.8
48	45	2.2	10	2.4	6	2.1	4	1.7	4	1.9	1	2.5	1	1.0	14	2.5	5	2.3
49	31	1.5	4	0.9	5	1.7	5	2.1	4	1.9	0	0	2	2.1	7	1.2	4	1.8
50*	38	1.8	4	0.9	7	2.4	7	2.9	2	1.0	0	0	3	3.1	13	2.3	4	1.8
51	35	1.7	2	0.5	7	2.4	5	2.1	4	1.9	0	0	2	2.1	10	1.8	3	1.4
52	27	1.3	4	0.9	3	1.0	3	1.3	4	1.9	0	0	2	2.1	7	1.2	4	1.8
53	33	1.6	7	1.7	5	1.7	5	2.1	2	1.0	0	0	2	2.1	11	2.0	2	0.9
54	39	1.8	7	1.7	7	2.4	7	2.9	4	1.9	0	0	2	2.1	10	1.8	2	0.9
55	26	1.2	3	0.7	3	1.0	3	1.3	4	1.9	0	0	1	1.0	6	1.1	5	2.3
56	38	1.8	5	1.2	4	1.4	4	1.7	1	0.5	0	0	2	2.1	12	2.1	5	2.3
57	27	1.3	7	1.7	2	0.7	5	2.1	4	1.9	1	2.5	2	2.1	3	0.5	3	1.4
58	27	1.3	6	1.4	1	0.3	2	0.8	4	1.9	2	5.0	1	1.0	7	1.2	4	1.8
59	17	0.8	2	0.5	1	0.3	1	0.4	4	1.9	1	2.5	1	1.0	3	0.5	4	1.8
60	14	0.7	2	0.5	1	0.3	1	0.4	3	1.5	1	2.5	1	1.0	2	0.4	5	2.3
61	33	1.6	7	1.7	3	1.0	3	1.3	3	1.5	1	2.5	2	2.1	10	1.8	4	1.8
62	28	1.4	2	0.5	3	1.0	4	1.7	4	1.9	2	5.0	1	1.0	8	1.4	4	1.8
63	29	1.4	6	1.4	3	1.9	3	1.3	4	1.9	2	5.0	1	1.0	6	1.1	4	1.8
64	27	1.3	3	0.7	4	1.4	3	1.3	4	1.9	0	0	1	1.0	8	1.4	4	1.8
65	38	1.8	5	1.2	6	2.1	5	2.1	4	1.9	0	0	1	1.9	12	2.1	5	2.3
66	31	1.5	8	1.9	4	1.4	1	0.4	4	1.9	1	2.5	1	1.9	8	1.4	4	1.8
67	56	2.7	19	4.5	10	3.5	3	1.3	4	1.9	0	0	1	1.0	19	3.4	2	0.9
68	33	1.6	10	2.4	5	1.7	3	1.3	4	1.9	0	0	1	1.0	10	1.8	2	0.9
69	43	2.1	6	1.4	4	1.4	4	1.7	4	1.9	1	2.5	2	2.1	16	2.8	6	2.7
70	42	2.0	4	0.9	7	2.4	6	2.6	4	1.9	2	5.0	1	1.9	14	2.5	4	1.8
All Sites	2137	100.0	433	20.4	288	13.8	240	11.5	206	9.9	40	1.8	96	4.5	597	27.4	237	10.6

*Interviews were not complete in these sites due to restrictions or difficulties with the data collection; the collection was 98% complete.

DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

Frequencies of Respondents by Program and Type

PROGRAM	MEAN RATINGS																	
	Total		Student		Program Teacher		Aide		Non-Prog. Teacher		Resource Teacher		Administrator		Parent		Community	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Comprehensive bilingual	938	44.2	110	27.2	145	52.2	142	59.7	102	49.5	18	45.0	59	61.5	254	41.5	109	46.8
Bilingual ILP Regular Eng.	215	10.0	43	9.7	30	10.5	26	10.9	27	13.1	2	5.0	9	9.4	54	8.7	24	10.9
Special Prog. for Recent Arrivals	19	0.8	5	1.2	2	0.7	0	0	1	0.5	1	2.5	1	1.0	4	0.7	6	2.6
Tutoring/Cult. Studies	51	2.5	16	3.8	2	0.7	3	1.3	4	1.9	1	2.5	3	3.1	14	2.5	8	3.6
Departmentalized Bil. Secondary	580	27.8	176	41.6	84	29.4	41	17.2	44	21.4	8	20.0	12	12.5	173	30.7	42	17.7
Multiresource Center	44	2.0	8	1.9	4	1.4	4	1.7	10	4.9	5	12.5	2	2.1	6	1.1	5	1.3
Language Continuum	44	2.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2.1	20	3.5	22	10.0
Immersion	14	0.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3.1	5	0.9	6	2.6
Elementary BILP/ ESL Pullout	131	6.3	44	10.4	7	2.4	10	4.2	13	6.3	4	10.0	3	3.1	42	7.4	8	3.2
Secondary BILP/ ESL Pullout	48	2.3	14	3.3	5	1.7	7	2.9	4	1.9	1	2.5	2	2.1	13	2.3	2	0.9
Bilingual Team Teaching	18	0.9	2	0.5	6	2.1	4	1.7	1	0.5	0	0	0	0	4	0.7	1	0.5
ILP with Supplemental Exercises																		
ILP with Primary Lang. Pullout	27	1.4	9	1.3	2	0.7	3	0.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0.2	4	0.5
TOTAL	2137	100.0	433	20.4	288	13.8	240	11.5	206	9.9	40	1.9	96	4.6	597	27.2	237	10.6

Languages and Language Groups of the Satisfaction Respondents

Language/Group	First Lang #	First Lang %	Other Lang #
AMERINDIAN	60	2.2	61
Apache	4	.1	2
Blackfoot	1	.0	1
Cherokee	1	.0	1
Guarani	3	.1	3
Hoopa	3	.0	1
Hopi	0	0	6
Kekchi	2	.1	2
Kewak	0	0	1
Makah	2	.1	1
Navajo	4	.1	1
Paiute	5	.1	2
Pit River	19	.6	26
Pomo	2	0	1
Seminole	1	.0	1
Shoshone	1	.0	1
Sioux	1	.0	1
Tolowa	3	.0	1
Washoe	0	0	1
Wintu	0	0	1
Wiyot	1	.0	1
Wukachi	0	0	1
Yurok	7	.3	5
ENGLISH	639	30.3	1100
SPANISH	940	44.3	325
OTHER EUROPEAN	91	4.1	108
Armenian	5	.2	3
Croatian	1	.0	0
Czech	1	.0	0
Danish	1	.0	0
Dutch	1	.0	0
Euskara	1	.0	1
Flemish	1	.0	0
French	9	.4	61
Gaelic	1	.0	0
German	12	.6	20
Greek	2	.1	0
Italian	13	.6	14
Magyar	2	.1	0
Norwegian	0	0	1
Polish	2	.1	0
Portuguese	32	1.5	5
Romansch	1	.0	0
Russian	4	.2	1
Serbian	0	0	1
Slovak	1	.0	0
Swedish	1	.0	0
JAPANESE	26	1.2	13
KOREAN	24	1.2	2
HAN	165	7.8	37
Cantonese	151	7.1	26
Chow Chow	0	0	1
Fuchow	2	.1	2
Hoiping	1	.0	2
Mandarin	8	.4	54
Suchow	0	0	2
Toishan	3	.1	0
INDOCHINESE	71	3.5	85
Burmese	13	.6	10
Cambodian	3	.1	0
Laotian	2	.1	1
Mnong	4	.2	0
Thai	7	.3	1
Vietnamese	42	2.0	73
INDIA/PAKIS.	17	.8	6
Hindi	1	.0	1
Panjabi	14	.7	5
Urdu	2	.1	0
PACIFIC TER.	14	.7	4
Chamorro	6	.3	0
Samoan	6	.3	2
Trukese	2	.1	2
FILIPINO	78	3.7	34
Bicol	2	.1	0
Chabacano	1	.0	0
Hiligaynon	1	.0	0
Ibanag	2	.1	0
Ilocano	12	.5	8
Pampango	2	.1	1
Pangasinan	7	.3	1
Tagalog	19	2.3	22
Visayan	2	.1	1
MIDEAST/AFR.	12	.6	16
Amharic	1	.0	0
Arabic	2	.1	9
Farsi	6	.3	0
Hebrew	1	.0	4
Lebanese (Arabic)	0	0	1
Swahili	0	0	1
Turkish	0	0	1
Yiddish	2	.1	0
TOTAL	2137	100*	1847**

*The columns do not actually add to 100% because of rounding.

**While the first language numbers correspond to the exact number of respondents, those for the other languages do not since some spoke more than two languages.

Frequencies of Sample Respondents by First Language Group and Type

Language Group	Total		Student		Program teacher		Aide		Non-Prog. teacher		Resource teacher		Administrator		Parent		Community	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Amerindian	60	2.2	13	3.4	1	0.3	7	1.3	2	1.0	0	0	0	0	25	3.4	12	4.1
English	639	30.3	112	26.5	106	37.1	49	20.6	148	71.8	20	50.0	58	60.4	51	8.7	95	39.1
Spanish	940	44.3	193	48.7	121	37.8	134	54.2	21	9.2	12	30.0	25	26.0	350	60.6	84	36.8
Other European	91	4.5	17	4.4	15	5.2	6	2.5	15	7.3	0	0	7	7.3	24	4.2	7	3.2
Japanese	26	1.2	3	0.7	3	1.0	2	0.8	6	2.9	1	2.5	0	0	7	1.4	4	1.4
Korean	24	1.2	6	1.4	3	1.0	4	1.7	0	0	0	0	1	1.2	9	1.6	1	0.5
Han	165	7.8	28	6.6	27	9.4	27	11.3	8	3.9	3	7.5	3	3.1	54	9.0	15	6.8
Indochinese	71	3.4	34	8.0	2	0.7	1	0.4	1	0.5	0	0	0	0	30	5.3	3	1.4
India/Pakistani	17	0.8	5	1.4	1	0.3	2	0.8	0	0	0	0	1	1.0	5	1.1	3	1.4
Pacific Terr.	14	0.6	4	0.9	1	0.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	1.6	0	0
Filipino	78	3.6	17	4.0	8	2.8	7	2.9	3	1.5	4	10.0	1	1.0	28	4.8	10	3.6
Mideast/Africa	12	0.5	1	0.2	0	0	1	0.4	2	1.0	0	0	0	0	5	0.2	3	0.1
Total	2137	100.0	433	20.4	288	13.9	240	11.5	206	9.9	40	1.9	96	4.6	597	27.2	237	10.6

DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

Summary of General School Satisfaction Ratings by Type of Respondent and Respondent Characteristic

Respondent Type/ Characteristic	Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance	N*
All Respondents	3.883	0.967	0.936	2120
Pupils	4.097	0.792	0.628	433
Program Teachers	3.855	1.018	1.037	287
Program Aides	3.925	0.918	0.843	239
Non-Program Teachers	3.608	0.939	0.882	204
Resource Teachers	3.975	1.000	0.999	40
Administrators	4.167	0.763	0.582	96
Program Parents	3.961	0.952	0.906	594
Community Members	3.274	1.241	1.539	227
First Language/Group				
Amerindian	3.983	0.827	0.684	37
Han	4.135	0.953	0.909	103
Other European**	3.604	0.998	0.996	64
MidEast/African	3.750	1.215	1.477	8
Filipino	4.199	0.689	0.475	52
Indochinese	4.296	0.725	0.526	47
India/Pakistani	4.236	0.664	0.441	15
Pacific Territorial	3.750	0.708	0.500	5
Japanese	3.600	1.198	1.417	16
Korean	3.987	1.042	1.085	13
Spanish	3.882	0.975	0.950	760
English	3.795	0.982	0.964	548
Number of Languages Spoken				
Monolinguals	3.866	1.000	1.000	578
Bilinguals	3.911	0.938	0.879	1257
Multilinguals	3.801	1.019	1.038	285
Kind of Program				
Comprehensive Bilingual	3.906	0.978	0.956	947
BILP/Regular English	3.825	0.964	0.930	208
Recent Arrival Centers	4.255	0.624	0.390	16
Tutoring/Culture Centers	3.804	0.775	0.601	51
Departmental Secondary	3.858	0.995	0.991	582
MultiResource Centers	4.050	0.783	0.613	40
Language Continuum	3.591	0.996	0.992	44
Immersion	4.000	0.877	0.760	14
Elementary BILP/ESL	3.831	0.890	0.793	132
Secondary BILP/ESL	3.789	1.019	1.039	47
Team Teaching	4.000	0.970	0.941	18
ILP/Primary Language Class	4.625	0.495	0.245	21

*Excludes those who did not answer or who said "Don't Know."

**Excluding English and Spanish.

Distribution of Ratings for General School Satisfaction

Respondent Type/ Characteristic	Percentage						
	Total Dis-agree	Dis-Agree	Unde-cided	Agree	Total Agree	Don't Know	No Reply
All Respondents	1.3	8.8	12.3	49.1	27.1	0.7	0.1
Pupils	0.5	4.2	11.5	52.7	23.3	0	0
Program Teachers	2.1	11.8	10.4	48.3	27.1	0.3	0
Program Aides	1.7	6.7	14.2	50.4	26.7	0.4	0
Non-Program Teachers	0.5	13.5	13.5	54.1	16.9	1.0	0.5
Resource Teachers	0	15.0	5.0	47.5	32.5	0	0
Administrators	0	6.3	3.1	58.3	32.3	0	0
Program Parents	1.2	7.7	12.9	46.0	31.8	0.2	0.3
Community Members	8.1	14.0	16.6	42.6	14.5	4.3	0
First Language/Group							
Amerindian	0	3.4	24.1	43.1	29.3	0	0
Han	1.8	8.5	6.1	42.1	30.9	0.6	0
Other European*	3.3	11.0	11.0	60.4	12.1	2.2	0
MidEast/African	8.3	8.3	8.3	50.0	25.0	0	0
Filipino	0	2.6	9.0	51.3	35.9	1.3	0
Indochinese	0	1.4	11.3	43.7	43.7	0	0
India/Pakistani	0	0	11.8	52.9	35.3	0	0
Pacific Territorial	0	0	37.5	50.0	12.5	0	0
Japanese	7.7	15.4	0	61.5	15.4	0	0
Korean	0	8.3	4.2	45.8	37.5	0	4.2
Spanish	2.1	8.4	12.3	49.8	26.8	0.9	0.1
English	1.6	11.2	14.2	48.7	23.3	0.9	0.2
Number of Languages							
Monolingual	0.8	10.8	12.8	44.3	29.9	1.0	0.3
Bilingual	1.9	7.0	12.5	51.3	26.7	0.6	0.1
Multilingual	3.2	12.0	10.7	49.8	23.6	0.6	0
Kind of Program							
Comprehensive Bilingual	1.3	10.2	9.1	49.2	29.0	0.9	0.2
BILP/Reg. English	2.8	5.6	14.4	51.2	24.7	1.4	0
Recent Arrival Ctrs.	0	5.3	5.3	47.4	36.8	5.3	0
Tutoring/Culture Ctrs.	0	5.9	23.5	54.9	15.7	0	0
Depart. Secondary	2.2	10.0	14.3	46.0	27.2	0.3	0
MultiResource Ctrs.	2.5	0	12.5	60.0	25.0	0	0
Language Continuum	4.5	9.1	22.7	50.0	13.6	0	0
Immersion	0	7.1	14.3	50.0	28.6	0	0
Elem. BILP/ESL	2.3	5.3	19.1	52.7	20.6	0	0
Secondary BILP/ESL	2.1	8.3	10.4	56.3	20.8	0	2.1
Team Teaching	5.6	0	11.1	55.6	27.8	0	0
ILP/Primary Language	0	0	0	37.5	62.5	0	0

*Excluding English and Spanish.

Summary of the Ratings on the Importance of Speaking Two or More Languages

Respondent Type/ Characteristic	Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance	N*
All Respondents	4.062	1.131	1.279	2106
Pupils	4.202	0.859	0.738	420
Program Teachers	4.139	1.065	1.135	282
Program Aides	4.302	0.925	0.856	238
Non-Program Teachers	2.908	1.320	1.743	205
Resource Teachers	3.555	1.526	2.328	38
Administrators	3.969	1.235	1.525	96
Program Parents	4.359	0.871	0.759	591
Community Members	3.834	1.336	1.785	236
First Language/Group				
Amerindian	4.252	0.753	0.567	59
Han	4.384	0.812	0.659	152
Other European**	3.989	1.304	1.700	91
MidEast/African	4.083	1.165	1.356	13
Filipino	4.413	0.755	0.570	78
Indochinese	4.150	0.891	0.794	69
India/Pakistani	4.647	0.702	0.493	17
Pacific Territorial	4.125	1.126	1.268	8
Japanese	4.080	0.862	0.743	26
Korean	4.292	1.122	1.259	24
Spanish	4.346	0.889	0.791	918
English	3.464	1.380	1.903	614
Number of Languages Spoken				
Monolinguals	3.792	1.311	1.720	580
Bilinguals	4.188	1.001	1.002	1232
Multilinguals	4.074	1.153	1.330	294
Kind of Program				
Comprehensive Bilingual	4.090	1.175	1.380	926
BILP/Regular English	3.748	1.269	1.611	206
Recent Arrival Centers	4.529	1.007	1.015	17
Tutoring/Culture Centers	3.605	1.157	1.340	48
Departmental Secondary	4.218	0.996	0.991	575
MultiResource Centers	3.289	1.471	2.164	37
Language Continuum	4.289	1.041	1.085	43
Immersion	3.970	1.284	1.648	13
Elementary BILP/ESL	3.850	1.075	1.155	127
Secondary BILP/ESL	4.313	0.949	0.900	48
Team Teaching	4.000	0.974	0.941	17
ILP/Primary Language Class	4.875	0.338	0.114	24

*Excludes those who did not answer or said "Don't Know."
**Excluding English and Spanish.

NOTE: The distribution of the responses is given in Table 18, Appendix C.

Distribution of Ratings on the Importance of Speaking Two or More Languages

Respondent Type/ Characteristic	Percentage						
	Total Dis-agree	Dis-Agree	Unde-cided	Agree	Total Agree	Don't Know	No Reply
All Respondents	3.5	8.0	9.9	28.2	48.9	1.0	0.4
Pupils	0.5	3.5	7.9	36.0	49.2	2.5	0.5
Program Teachers	1.7	8.0	8.0	28.5	51.7	1.0	1.0
Program Aides	0.8	6.7	4.2	31.7	55.8	0.4	0.4
Non-Program Teachers	15.0	27.1	22.2	20.3	14.5	0	1.0
Resource Teachers	10.0	10.0	12.5	22.5	40.0	0	5.0
Administrators	3.1	16.7	8.3	24.0	47.9	0	0
Program Parents	1.2	2.5	10.5	25.4	50.4	1.0	0
Community Members	8.9	11.5	9.4	26.4	43.4	0	0.4
First Language/Group							
Amerindian	0	1.7	8.6	24.1	63.8	1.7	0
Han	0.6	3.0	5.5	29.9	59.1	1.8	0
Other European*	7.7	8.8	12.1	19.8	51.6	0	0
MidEast/African	8.3	0	8.3	41.7	41.7	0	0
Filipino	0	2.6	7.7	33.3	56.4	0	0
Indochinese	0	2.8	16.9	28.2	49.3	2.8	0
India/Pakistani	0	0	11.8	11.8	76.5	0	0
Pacific Territorial	0	12.5	12.5	25.0	50.0	0	0
Japanese	0	3.8	19.2	42.3	34.6	0	0
Korean	4.2	4.2	12.5	16.7	73.6	0	0
Spanish	1.5	3.5	6.3	30.7	56.9	0.7	0.3
English	7.9	18.4	14.9	25.0	31.3	1.2	1.2
Number of Languages							
Monolingual	5.9	13.9	11.7	23.6	43.4	0.7	0.8
Bilingual	2.3	4.9	9.0	31.0	51.2	1.2	0.5
Multilingual	3.9	9.7	10.0	25.6	50.2	0.6	0
Kind of Program							
Comprehensive Bilingual	4.1	9.0	9.1	24.8	51.7	0.6	0.5
BILP/Regular English	6.0	12.6	8.4	34.4	36.7	1.4	0.5
Recent Arrival Ctrs.	5.3	0	0	21.1	73.7	0	0
Tutoring/Culture Ctrs.	3.9	5.9	19.6	35.3	29.4	5.9	0
Depart. Secondary	1.9	5.7	10.3	30.1	51.1	0.3	0.5
MultiResource Centers	5.0	22.5	7.5	27.5	30.0	5.0	2.5
Language Continuum	4.5	0	11.4	20.5	61.4	2.3	0
Immersion	7.1	0	0	28.6	57.1	0	7.1
Elementary BILP/ESL	2.3	7.6	19.1	33.6	35.1	2.3	0
Secondary BILP/ESL	2.1	6.3	2.1	37.5	52.1	0	0
Team Teaching	0	5.6	11.1	33.3	44.4	5.6	0
ILP/Primary Language	0	0	0	12.5	87.5	0	0

*Excludes English and Spanish.

Summary of the Ratings on the Bilingual Legislation

Respondent Type/ Characteristic	Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance	N*
All Respondents	3.718	1.428	1.462	1673
Pupils		Not applicable*		
Program Teachers	3.836	1.188	1.412	287
Program Aides	4.073	0.935	0.874	239
Non-Program Teachers	2.824	1.228	1.508	206
Resource Teachers	3.550	1.319	1.741	40
Administrators	3.510	1.206	1.453	94
Program Parents	3.818	1.016	1.032	584
Community Members	3.245	1.410	1.988	237
First Language/Group				
Amerindian	3.108	0.930	0.993	37
Han	4.411	1.019	1.082	103
Other European **	3.287	1.268	1.154	64
MidEast/African	3.833	1.030	1.061	8
Filipino	4.053	0.925	0.704	52
Indochinese	4.194	0.870	0.754	52
India/Pakistani	4.182	0.644	0.596	15
Pacific Territorial	3.750	1.032	0.982	5
Japanese	3.654	0.990	0.857	16
Korean	4.235	0.826	0.822	13
Spanish	3.972	1.895	1.591	760
English	3.244	1.726	1.979	548
Number of Languages Spoken				
Monolingual	3.318	1.302	1.246	472
Bilingual	3.823	1.247	1.291	1014
Multilingual	3.649	1.209	1.277	187

*Excludes those who did not answer, who answered "Don't Know," and the students, who were not asked this question.

NOTE: The distribution of the replies by respondent characteristics is shown in Table 19 in Appendix C.

Distribution of Ratings of the Bilingual Education Legislation

Respondent Type/ Characteristics	Percentage						
	Total Dis-agree	Dis-Agree	Unde-cided	Agree	Total Agree	Don't Know	No Reply
All Respondents	5.7	12.6	14.4	36.6	29.0	1.8	0.1
Pupils	Not Applicable*						
Program Teachers	3.1	14.2	12.5	30.9	38.2	0.7	0.3
Program Aides	1.7	5.0	12.1	42.1	38.3	0.8	0
Non-Program Teachers	15.5	26.1	20.3	30.9	5.8	1.0	0.5
Resource Teachers	10.0	15.0	12.5	35.0	27.5	0	0
Administrators	4.2	22.9	14.6	34.4	24.0	0	0
Program Parents	2.2	5.4	15.7	41.5	31.8	3.5	0
Community Members	13.2	20.0	10.6	31.0	22.6	1.7	0
First Language Group							
Amerindian	8.3	20.8	25.0	20.8	25.0	0	0
Han	0.7	8.4	11.0	30.1	39.7	8.8	0.7
Other European**	10.6	11.8	23.5	34.1	20.0	0	0
MidEast/African	8.3	0	8.3	66.7	16.7	0	0
Filipino	3.3	9.8	4.9	47.5	32.7	1.6	0
Indochinese	0	8.3	8.3	38.9	44.4	0.6	0
India/Pakistani	0	0	18.1	34.4	36.3	0	0
Pacific Territorial	0	25.0	25.0	0	50.0	0	0
Japanese	4.4	17.3	13.0	34.8	30.4	0	0
Korean	11.1	5.6	5.6	27.8	50.0	0	0
Spanish	3.4	6.8	14.8	42.1	37.2	1.3	0
English	10.0	22.5	14.8	33.9	16.5	1.3	0.2
Number of Languages							
Monolingual	8.5	14.0	15.4	34.2	24.5	3.2	0.2
Bilingual	3.8	11.1	14.4	38.0	31.5	0.1	0
Multilingual	6.8	14.8	12.4	38.1	28.2	0.1	0.1
Kind of Program							
Comprehensive Bilingual	4.8	12.1	10.1	36.9	33.8	2.2	0.2
BILP/Regular English	6.9	15.1	21.5	34.9	20.3	1.7	0
Recent Arrival Ctrs.	7.1	14.3	7.1	42.9	28.6	0	0
Tutoring/Culture Ctrs.	20.0	34.3	34.3	8.6	2.9	0	0
Depart. Secondary	4.9	12.1	17.8	40.5	22.7	2.0	0
MultiResource Centers	18.8	18.8	9.4	37.5	15.6	0	0
Language Continuum	11.4	2.3	13.6	18.2	52.3	2.3	0
Immersion	7.1	0	14.3	35.7	42.9	0	0
Elementary BILP/ESL	4.5	13.6	19.3	44.3	17.0	1.1	0
Secondary BILP/ESL	0	6.3	12.5	25.0	56.3	0	0
ILP/Primary Language	6.7	6.7	13.3	26.7	46.7	0	0

*Students did not answer this question.
**Excluding English and Spanish.

Summary of the Ratings of the Children's Progress in the Classes

Respondent Type/ Characteristic	Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance	N*
All Respondents	3.712	1.044	1.090	2076
Pupils	4.026	0.799	0.639	433
Program Teachers	3.753	1.058	1.119	288
Program Aides	3.877	0.963	0.937	238
Non-Program Teachers	3.578	1.381	1.908	178
Resource Teachers	3.625	1.254	1.574	40
Administrators	4.086	0.898	0.807	95
Program Parents	3.944	0.918	0.843	597
Community Members	3.007	1.332	1.774	217
First Language Group				
Amerindian	4.002	0.859	0.738	57
Han	3.967	0.956	0.915	159
Other European**	3.335	1.128	1.273	91
MidEast/African	3.250	0.866	0.750	12
Filipino	3.923	0.853	0.727	77
Indochinese	4.141	0.816	0.666	70
India/Pakistani	4.294	0.686	0.471	17
Pacific Territorial	3.624	0.518	0.268	8
Japanese	3.800	0.978	0.957	25
Korean	4.235	0.797	0.636	24
Spanish	3.821	0.994	0.988	914
English	3.515	1.167	1.363	622
Number of Languages Spoken				
Monolingual	3.616	1.081	1.169	578
Bilingual	3.768	1.014	1.029	1204
Multilingual	3.967	1.086	1.179	293
Kind of Program				
Comprehensive Bilingual	3.743	1.074	1.153	920
BILP/Regular English	3.339	1.964	1.132	206
Recent Arrival Centers	3.247	0.849	0.721	15
Tutoring/Culture Centers	4.157	0.857	0.735	50
Departmental Secondary	3.687	0.996	0.991	575
MultiResource Centers	2.687	1.498	2.233	38
Language Continuum	3.568	0.998	0.995	44
Immersion	3.429	0.852	0.725	12
Elementary BILP/ESL	3.652	0.791	0.625	126
Secondary BILP/ESL	4.002	1.148	1.317	46
Team Teaching	4.167	1.295	1.676	18
ILP/Primary Language Class	4.750	0.442	0.196	24

*Excludes those that did not answer and those that said "Don't Know."
**Excluding English and Spanish.

Distribution of Ratings on Pupil Progress in the Classes

Respondent Type/ Characteristic	Percentage						
	Total Dis-agree	Dis-Agree	Unde-cided	Agree	Total Agree	Don't Know	No Reply
All Respondents	2.1	9.9	14.7	45.6	24.8	2.7	0.2
Pupils	0	4.8	13.9	52.4	8.6	0	0
Program Teachers	2.1	11.5	12.5	46.2	25.7	1.7	0.3
Program Aides	1.3	9.2	11.3	50.8	26.3	0.8	0.4
Non-Program Teachers	3.4	23.2	23.7	29.0	6.8	13.0	1.0
Resource Teachers	7.5	15.0	12.5	37.5	27.5	0	0
Administrators	1.0	6.3	7.3	47.9	36.5	1.0	0
Program Parents	1.8	6.4	14.2	48.2	29.4	0	0
Community Members	6.0	15.7	19.6	35.3	14.0	9.4	0
First Language/Group							
Amerindian	0	3.4	15.5	37.9	41.4	1.7	0
Han	0	7.3	10.4	39.6	38.4	3.7	0.6
Other European*	3.3	8.8	18.7	47.3	14.3	7.7	0
MidEast/African	0	16.7	50.0	25.0	8.3	0	0
Filipino	0	9.0	11.5	50.0	28.2	1.3	0
Indochinese	0	4.2	14.1	45.1	36.6	0	0
India/Pakistani	0	0	11.8	47.1	41.2	0	0
Pacific Territorial	0	0	37.5	62.5	0	0	0
Japanese	0	11.5	3.8	57.7	23.1	3.8	0
Korean	0	4.2	12.5	50.0	33.3	0	0
Spanish	2.2	9.2	13.8	48.5	25.6	0.5	0.2
English	3.3	13.4	16.8	42.3	18.4	5.6	0.3
Number of Languages							
Monolingual	2.5	11.0	15.9	43.9	23.1	3.4	0.2
Bilingual	2.0	8.7	14.8	46.7	25.5	2.1	0.2
Multilingual	1.6	12.3	12.3	44.3	25.2	3.6	0.6
Kind of Program							
Comprehensive Bilingual	2.0	11.4	11.9	43.5	28.2	2.7	0.3
BILP/Regular English	2.3	10.7	17.7	47.0	18.1	4.2	0
Recent Arrival Ctrs.	0	15.8	0	52.6	26.3	5.3	0
Tutoring/Culture Ctrs.	0	5.9	11.8	43.1	39.2	0	0
Depart. Secondary	2.2	8.8	17.2	49.1	20.7	2.1	0
MultiResource Ctrs.	5.0	12.5	2.5	37.5	22.5	15.0	5.0
Language Continuum	4.5	4.5	38.6	34.1	18.2	0	0
Immersion	0	14.3	35.7	42.9	7.1	0	0
Elementary BILP/ESL	0.8	5.3	24.4	58.8	9.2	1.5	0
Secondary BILP/ESL	4.2	10.4	4.2	41.7	37.5	2.1	0
Team Teaching	5.5	11.1	5.6	16.7	61.1	0	0
ILP/Primary Language	0	0	0	25.0	75.0	0	0

*Excluding English and Spanish.

Summary of the Respondent Ratings of the Way the Classes Are Taught

Respondent Type/ Characteristic	Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance	N*
All Respondents	3.607	1.152	1.328	2064
Pupils	4.032	0.947	0.897	433
Program Teachers	3.611	1.152	1.328	279
Program Aides	3.835	1.057	1.116	235
Non-Program Teachers	2.645	1.422	2.023	179
Resource Teachers	3.625	1.275	1.625	40
Administrators	4.135	0.816	0.666	96
Program Parents	3.736	1.093	1.195	591
Community Members	2.838	1.451	2.106	211
First Language/Group				
Amerindian	3.648	1.317	1.734	56
Han	4.066	0.977	0.954	162
Other European**	2.956	1.260	1.589	85
MidEast/African	3.750	0.965	0.932	12
Filipino	3.730	0.920	0.847	74
Indochinese	4.056	1.120	1.254	71
India/Pakistani	4.353	0.862	0.743	17
Pacific Territorial	3.125	1.356	1.839	8
Japanese	3.310	1.294	1.673	25
Korean	3.549	1.204	1.440	22
Spanish	3.692	1.092	1.192	935
English	3.342	1.252	1.567	597
Number of Languages Spoken				
Monolingual	3.508	1.210	1.463	575
Bilingual	3.685	1.107	1.226	1178
Multilingual	3.522	1.220	1.487	291
Kind of Program				
Comprehensive Bilingual	3.663	1.141	1.302	901
BILP/Regular English	3.281	1.267	1.606	205
Recent Arrival Centers	3.895	0.903	0.816	17
Tutoring/Culture Centers	3.902	1.063	1.130	51
Departmental Secondary	3.626	1.094	1.197	581
MultiResource Centers	3.366	1.604	2.574	33
Language Continuum	3.659	1.238	1.532	44
Immersion	3.786	1.188	1.412	14
Elementary BILP/ESL	3.585	1.936	1.073	130
Secondary BILP/ESL	3.079	1.414	2.000	46
Team Teaching	4.278	0.895	0.801	18
ILP/Primary Language Class	4.917	0.282	0.080	24

*Excludes those that did not answer and those that said "Don't Know."
**Excluding English and Spanish.

Distribution of the Ratings on How the Classes Are Taught

Respondent Type/ Characteristic	Percentage						
	Total Dis-agree	Dis-Agree	Unde-cided	Agree	Total Agree	Don't Know	No Reply
All Respondents	3.9	10.2	15.0	40.6	26.3	3.7	0.4
Pupils	3.0	5.3	9.0	50.6	32.1	0	0
Program Teachers	3.5	13.5	13.2	41.7	25.0	3.1	0
Program Aides	2.5	8.3	13.3	44.2	29.6	1.3	0.8
Non-Program Teachers	5.3	18.8	22.7	30.4	8.2	12.1	1.4
Resource Teachers	7.5	15.0	15.0	32.5	30.0	0	0
Administrators	0	7.3	5.2	54.2	33.3	0	0
Program Parents	2.8	8.2	18.4	37.6	30.1	2.3	0.5
Community Members	9.4	14.5	18.3	29.8	16.2	11.9	0
First Language/Group							
Amerindian	6.9	8.6	17.2	20.7	43.1	3.4	0
Han	1.8	4.3	12.8	38.4	40.2	1.8	0.6
Other European*	6.6	9.9	22.0	36.3	18.7	6.6	0
MidEast/African	0	8.3	33.3	33.3	25.0	0	0
Filipino	0	9.0	12.8	50.0	23.1	5.1	0
Indochinese	5.6	5.6	8.5	38.0	42.3	0	0
India/Pakistani	0	5.9	5.0	35.3	52.0	0	0
Pacific Territorial	12.5	25.0	12.5	37.5	12.5	0	0
Japanese	3.8	23.1	11.5	38.5	19.2	3.8	0
Korean	0	8.3	12.5	50.0	20.8	0	8.3
Spanish	3.7	10.2	16.2	42.9	25.4	1.5	0.2
English	4.7	12.0	13.7	39.5	22.1	7.6	0.5
Number of Languages							
Monolingual	4.2	11.0	14.7	39.2	25.3	4.7	0.8
Bilingual	3.7	9.2	15.5	42.2	26.4	2.8	0.2
Multilingual	4.2	12.3	13.3	36.9	27.5	5.5	0.3
Kind of Program							
Comprehensive Bilingual	3.4	10.5	12.1	41.2	28.3	4.1	0.4
BILP/Regular English	7.0	13.0	15.3	40.9	19.1	4.2	0.5
Recent Arrival Ctrs.	0	15.8	5.3	47.4	26.3	5.3	0
Tutoring/Culture Ctrs.	2.0	9.8	19.6	33.3	35.3	0	0
Depart. Secondary	3.6	8.4	19.1	42.0	23.6	3.3	0
MultiResource Centers	10.0	12.5	7.5	42.5	10.0	12.5	5.0
Language Continuum	6.8	11.4	22.7	27.3	31.8	0	0
Immersion	7.1	7.1	14.3	42.9	28.6	0	0
Elementary BILP/ESL	3.1	10.7	22.1	45.0	17.6	1.5	0
Secondary BILP/ESL	6.3	12.5	8.3	33.3	29.2	8.3	2.1
Team Teaching	0	5.6	11.1	33.3	50.0	0	0
ILP/Primary Language	0	0	0	8.3	91.7	0	0

*Excludes English and Spanish

Summary of the Respondent Ratings of the Teaching of Cultures

Respondent Type/ Characteristic	Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance	N*
All Respondents	3.561	1.126	1.269	2020
Pupils	3.756	0.935	0.874	429
Program Teachers	3.650	1.130	1.278	282
Program Aides	3.699	1.137	1.293	231
Non-Program Teachers	3.447	1.142	1.304	197
Resource Teachers	3.900	1.105	1.221	40
Administrators	3.914	1.099	1.208	94
Program Parents	3.455	1.102	1.215	539
Community Members	3.020	1.409	1.985	208
First Language Group				
Amerindian	3.746	1.311	1.719	55
Han	3.784	1.028	1.097	152
Other European**	3.020	1.380	1.904	82
MidEast/African	2.633	1.697	2.879	10
Filipino	3.232	1.114	1.240	73
Indochinese	3.375	1.120	1.254	65
India/Pakistani	4.059	1.029	1.059	17
Pacific Territorial	3.375	0.744	0.554	8
Japanese	3.600	1.143	1.307	25
Korean	3.256	1.318	1.737	21
Spanish	3.915	1.064	1.132	902
English	3.490	1.153	1.328	610
Number of Languages Spoken				
Monolingual	3.556	1.110	1.259	557
Bilingual	3.587	1.103	1.217	1176
Multilingual	3.473	1.247	1.555	287
Kind of Program				
Comprehensive Bilingual	3.638	1.039	1.080	907
BILP/Regular English	3.289	1.239	1.535	203
Recent Arrival Centers	3.902	1.251	1.566	18
Tutoring/Culture Centers	3.369	1.394	1.944	48
Departmental Secondary	3.436	1.118	1.251	557
MultiResource Centers	3.435	1.250	1.563	38
Language Continuum	3.970	1.106	1.224	41
Immersion	2.928	1.685	2.080	12
Elementary BILP/ESL	3.319	1.088	1.184	125
Secondary BILP/ESL	4.002	1.438	1.988	40
Team Teaching	3.250	1.029	1.059	16
ILP/Primary Language Class	4.667	0.482	0.232	24

*Excludes those that did not answer and those that said Don't Know.
**Excluding English and Spanish.

Distribution of the Ratings on the Teaching of Cultures

Respondent Type/ Characteristic	Percentage						
	Total Dis-agree	Dis-agree	Unde-cided	Agree	Total Agree	Don't Know	No Reply
All Respondents	3.1	9.1	16.1	42.2	24.1	5.0	0.5
Pupil	2.3	8.3	16.2	54.0	18.2	0.9	0
Program Teachers	2.8	13.5	16.0	40.6	25.0	1.4	0.7
Program Aides	4.2	7.9	15.4	39.2	29.6	3.8	0
Non-Program Teachers	3.9	11.6	15.9	45.9	17.9	3.9	1.0
Resource Teachers	2.5	12.5	12.5	37.5	35.0	0	0
Administrators	2.1	9.4	12.5	36.5	37.5	1.0	1.0
Program Parents	2.0	3.7	18.7	39.0	26.6	9.4	0.5
Community Members	6.4	17.0	11.9	33.6	19.6	10.6	0.9
First Language/Group							
Amerindian	8.6	5.2	8.6	39.7	32.8	3.4	1.7
Han	2.4	4.9	11.6	37.2	36.6	7.3	0
Other European*	5.5	14.3	24.2	29.7	16.5	7.7	2.2
MidEast/African	16.7	8.3	0	41.7	16.7	16.7	0
Filipino	2.6	9.0	15.4	37.2	29.5	6.4	0
Indochinese	1.4	5.6	28.2	36.6	19.7	7.0	1.4
India/Pakistani	5.9	0	11.8	47.1	35.3	0	0
Pacific Territorial	0	12.5	37.5	50.0	0	0	0
Japanese	3.8	7.7	19.2	42.3	23.1	3.8	0
Korean	0	8.3	20.8	33.3	25.0	4.2	8.3
Spanish	2.5	8.0	15.8	45.3	23.7	4.4	0.1
English	3.3	12.0	15.7	42.3	21.6	4.7	0.5
Number of Languages							
Monolingual	2.9	7.3	17.2	42.4	24.2	5.4	0.5
Bilingual	3.1	8.8	16.5	43.3	23.5	4.6	0.2
Multilingual	3.6	13.6	12.0	37.5	26.2	5.8	1.3
Kind of Program							
Comprehensive Bilingual	1.5	8.4	13.4	42.5	29.7	4.3	0.3
BILP/Regular English	5.1	13.5	19.1	38.1	18.1	5.6	0
Recent Arrival Ctrs.	5.3	15.8	5.3	26.3	42.1	5.3	0
Tutoring/Culture Ctrs.	13.7	3.9	5.9	52.9	17.6	3.9	2.0
Depart. Secondary	3.1	10.0	19.1	45.3	16.7	5.3	0.5
MultiResource Centers	7.5	5.0	20.0	45.0	17.5	2.5	2.5
Language Continuum	4.5	2.3	6.8	27.3	52.3	6.8	0
Immersion	14.3	7.1	14.3	14.3	35.7	14.3	0
Elementary BILP/ESL	4.6	8.4	28.2	45.0	9.2	3.8	0.8
Secondary BILP/ESL	4.2	12.5	12.5	27.1	27.1	14.6	2.1
Team Teaching	0	5.6	22.2	50.0	11.1	11.1	0
ILP/Primary Language	0	0	0	33.3	66.7	0	0

*Excludes English and Spanish.

Summary of the Respondent Ratings on Community Participation

Respondent Type/ Characteristic	Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance	N*
All Respondents	3.261	1.236	1.420	1457
Pupils		Not Applicable *		
Program Teachers	3.030	1.382	1.510	271
Program Aides	3.283	1.429	1.520	219
Non-Program Teachers	2.957	1.512	1.597	162
Resource Teachers	2.949	1.358	1.544	39
Administrators	3.177	1.390	1.531	95
Program Parents	3.606	1.362	1.555	485
Community Members	3.033	1.311	1.926	184
First Language/Group				
Amerindian	3.705	1.301	1.510	44
Han	3.541	1.127	1.197	109
Other Europeans**	3.117	1.389	1.994	68
MidEast/African	2.875	1.707	2.899	8
Filipino	3.269	1.106	1.248	52
Indochinese	3.689	1.221	1.343	29
India/Pakistani	3.636	1.120	1.100	11
Pacific Territorial	3.250	0.740	0.550	4
Japanese	3.105	1.149	1.399	19
Korean	3.611	1.217	1.731	18
Spanish	3.308	1.166	1.202	650
English	3.049	1.252	1.727	448
Number of Languages Spoken				
Monolingual	3.388	1.211	1.353	417
Bilingual	3.233	1.230	1.528	800
Multilingual	3.138	1.147	1.560	240

*Excludes Don't Know and No Reply; students did not answer this item.
**Excluding English and Spanish.

Distribution of the Ratings on Community Participation in the Programs

Respondent Type/ Characteristic	Percentage						
	Total Dis-agree	Dis-Agree	Unde-cided	Agree	Total Agree	Don't Know	No Reply
All Respondents	7.0	19.3	17.9	27.0	14.3	13.7	0.9
Pupils	Not Applicable*						
Program Teachers	9.0	28.1	19.8	25.3	11.8	5.2	0.7
Program Aides	8.3	19.6	17.1	30.4	15.8	7.9	0.8
Non-Program Teachers	7.2	21.3	23.2	20.8	5.8	19.8	1.9
Resource Teachers	12.5	25.0	25.0	25.0	10.0	0	2.5
Administrators	12.5	25.0	11.5	29.2	20.8	1.0	0
Program Parents	2.7	11.9	17.9	30.9	17.7	18.4	0.5
Community Members	10.2	22.1	13.2	20.4	12.3	20.4	1.3
First Language/Group							
Amerindian	2.1	16.7	12.5	12.5	35.4	8.3	0
Han	5.9	14.0	13.2	25.0	22.1	18.4	1.5
Other European**	7.0	18.8	22.4	21.2	10.6	16.5	3.5
MidEast/African	16.7	16.7	0	25.0	8.3	33.3	0
Filipino	8.2	14.8	11.5	27.9	16.4	18.0	0
Indochinese	2.6	10.5	18.4	21.1	23.7	23.7	0
India/Pakistani	9.1	18.2	9.1	45.5	18.2	0	0
Pacific Territorial	0	50.0	0	25.0	25.0	0	0
Japanese	4.3	17.4	30.4	26.1	4.3	0	0
Korean	16.7	16.7	5.5	11.1	50.0	0	0
Spanish	7.2	17.5	18.1	31.0	13.8	11.9	0.5
English	7.2	24.6	19.8	23.1	10.0	14.2	0.1
Number of Languages							
Monolingual	5.9	14.8	19.8	28.5	15.4	15.0	0.6
Bilingual	6.8	21.2	17.7	27.3	13.9	12.3	0.9
Multilingual	9.3	21.0	15.1	23.4	13.7	16.2	1.4
Kind of Program							
Comprehensive Bilingual	5.9	18.8	18.0	29.8	15.2	11.7	0.6
BILP/Regular English	8.1	18.0	16.3	30.2	11.6	14.0	0.2
Recent Arrival Centers	0	14.3	14.3	28.6	42.9	0	0
Tutoring/Culture Ctrs.	0	22.9	14.3	20.0	37.1	5.7	0
Depart. Secondary	7.9	20.0	20.2	23.2	12.6	14.8	1.2
MultiResource Centers	37.5	6.3	9.4	25.0	0	18.8	3.1
Language Continuum	6.8	15.9	9.1	18.2	13.6	36.4	0
Immersion	7.1	42.9	14.3	0	7.1	28.6	0
Elementary BILP/ESL	4.5	27.3	19.3	29.5	5.7	12.5	1.1
Secondary BILP/ESL	2.9	22.9	20.0	8.6	14.3	31.4	0
Team Teaching	18.8	18.8	31.3	12.5	12.5	6.3	0
ILP/Primary Language	0	0	0	46.7	53.3	0	0

*Students did not answer this question.
**Excluding English and Spanish.

42

Summary of the Preferences for the Period of Program Enrollment

Respondent Type/ Characteristics	Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance	N*
All Respondents	3.392	1.043	1.088	2122
Pupils	3.483	1.002	1.004	432
Program Teachers	3.440	1.022	1.045	285
Program Aides	3.588	0.945	0.893	238
Non-Program Teachers	2.763	0.856	0.749	204
Resource Teachers	3.325	0.859	0.738	40
Administrators	3.402	1.035	1.072	94
Program Parents	3.538	1.034	1.070	595
Community Members	3.200	1.227	1.507	234
First Language/Group				
Amerindian	3.826	0.953	0.907	57
Han	3.601	1.081	1.169	162
Other European**	3.208	1.076	1.157	90
MidEast/African	3.417	1.311	1.720	12
Filipino	3.160	0.886	0.785	75
Indochinese	3.042	1.061	1.127	71
India/Pakistani	3.235	0.752	0.566	17
Pacific Territorial	3.000	0.926	0.857	8
Japanese	3.320	1.155	1.333	25
Korean	3.000	1.022	1.043	24
Spanish	3.546	1.012	1.024	939
English	3.209	1.033	1.067	639
Number of Languages Spoken				
Monolingual	2.765	1.102	1.215	587
Bilingual	3.462	0.994	0.988	228
Multilingual	3.297	1.099	1.208	307
Kind of Program				
Comprehensive Bilingual	3.600	1.024	1.049	949
BILP/Regular English	3.194	1.144	1.308	211
Recent Arrival Centers	3.353	0.786	0.618	19
Tutoring/Culture Centers	3.902	0.728	0.530	51
Departmental Secondary	3.230	0.995	0.991	575
MultiResource Centers	3.125	1.067	1.138	40
Language Continuum	3.091	1.053	1.108	44
Immersion	3.214	0.975	0.951	14
Elementary BILP/ESL	3.123	1.042	1.086	129
Secondary BILP/ESL	3.458	1.010	1.020	48
Team Teaching	3.500	1.150	1.324	18
ILP/Primary Language Class	4.500	0.659	0.435	25

*Excludes those that did not answer and those that said Don't Know.
**Excluding English and Spanish.

Distribution of Preferences for the Period of Program Enrollment for the Students

Respondent Type/ Characteristic	Percentage						
	Not at All	One Year	Until English Fluent	Fluent in English & Prim Lang	All of School	Don't Know	No Reply
All Respondents	4.6	9.7	39.4	29.7	15.9	0.3	0.4
Pupils	3.2	10.9	35.6	33.5	16.6	0.2	0
Program Teachers	3.5	8.3	43.1	27.4	16.7	0.7	0.3
Program Aides	0.8	7.1	40.4	32.5	18.3	0	0.8
Non-Program Teachers	7.2	17.4	59.4	13.5	1.0	0.5	1.0
Resource Teachers	2.5	7.5	55.0	25.0	10.0	0	0
Administrators	4.2	4.2	44.8	30.2	14.6	1.0	1.0
Program Parents	3.7	8.0	33.8	33.8	20.2	0.2	0.3
Community Members	13.2	12.3	32.3	26.8	14.9	0	0.4
First Language/Group							
Amerindian	1.7	5.2	20.7	44.8	25.9	1.7	0
Han	2.4	6.7	40.9	20.1	28.7	0.6	0.6
Other Europeans*	6.6	11.0	44.0	27.5	9.9	0	1.1
MidEast/African	8.3	16.7	25.0	25.0	25.0	0	0
Filipino	7.7	10.3	51.3	25.6	5.1	0	0
Indochinese	5.6	22.5	47.9	9.9	14.1	0	0
India/Pakistani	0	11.8	58.8	23.5	5.9	0	0
Pacific Territorial	0	37.5	25.0	37.5	0	0	0
Japanese	0	11.5	42.3	26.9	15.4	0	3.8
Korean	16.7	0	50.0	33.3	0	0	0
Spanish	3.5	8.1	33.7	36.0	18.1	0.2	0.4
English	6.2	11.4	45.4	24.6	11.8	0.3	0.3
Number of Languages Spoken							
Monolingual	6.1	11.3	40.4	24.3	17.1	0.3	0.5
Bilingual	3.4	8.4	39.3	32.5	15.7	0.2	0.4
Multilingual	6.8	12.0	37.5	28.5	14.6	0.3	0.3
Kind of Program							
Comprehensive Bil	3.7	7.6	34.8	31.9	21.8	0.2	0.1
BILP/Reg. English	8.4	11.6	41.9	25.6	10.7	0.5	1.4
Recent Arrival Ctrs.	10.5	15.8	26.3	47.4	0	0	0
Tutoring/Culture Ctrs.	2.0	2.0	13.7	68.6	13.7	0	0
Depart. Secondary	3.4	12.6	47.3	25.3	10.3	0.3	0.9
MultiResource Ctrs.	10.0	12.5	40.0	30.0	7.5	0	0
Language Continuum	11.4	11.4	38.6	34.1	4.5	0	0
Immersion	7.1	7.1	50.0	28.6	7.1	0	0
Elem. BILP/ESL	6.9	15.3	47.3	21.4	7.6	1.5	0
Secondary BILP/ESL	4.2	6.3	47.9	22.9	18.8	0	0
Team Teaching	11.1	0	33.3	38.9	16.7	0	0
ILP/Primary Language	0	0	8.3	33.3	58.3	0	0

*Excluding English and Spanish.

44

Summary of the Respondent Preferences for the Proportion of English to Primary Language

Respondent Type/ Characteristic	Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance	N*
All Respondents	2.149	1.057	1.118	2064
Pupils	2.223	0.736	0.541	433
Program Teachers	2.158	1.250	1.563	269
Program Aides	2.315	1.116	1.245	229
Non-Program Teachers	1.432	1.037	1.094	197
Resource Teachers	2.000	1.115	1.295	36
Administrators	1.615	1.135	1.355	80
Program Parents	2.223	0.793	0.629	595
Community Members	2.011	1.101	1.148	225
First Language/Group				
Amerindian	2.000	0.419	0.175	58
Han	2.231	1.133	1.284	156
Other European**	1.960	1.325	1.755	85
MidEast/African	1.917	0.515	0.265	12
Filipino	2.173	0.665	0.443	75
Indochinese	1.901	0.613	0.376	71
India/Pakistani	2.176	0.393	0.154	17
Pacific Territorial	2.125	0.835	0.696	8
Japanese	2.000	0.707	0.500	25
Korean	2.239	1.351	1.826	23
Spanish	2.289	0.995	0.991	920
English	1.991	1.182	1.397	610
Number of Languages Spoken				
Monolingual	2.043	1.016	1.032	576
Bilingual	2.180	1.043	1.089	1196
Multilingual	2.069	1.178	1.388	292
Kind of Program				
Comprehensive Bilingual	2.113	1.052	1.107	913
BILP/Regular English	1.733	1.386	1.422	198
Recent Arrival Centers	2.529	0.717	0.515	19
Tutoring/Culture Centers	1.841	0.747	0.558	50
Departmental Secondary	2.151	1.042	1.086	565
MultiResource Centers	2.025	0.568	0.589	40
Language Continuum	2.000	0.571	0.326	44
Immersion	2.071	0.475	0.225	14
Elementary BILP/ESL	1.962	0.730	0.533	131
Secondary BILP/ESL	2.083	0.821	0.674	48
Team Teaching	1.946	0.973	0.852	23
ILP/Primary Language Class				

*Excludes those that did not answer and those that said Don't Know.
**Excluding English and Spanish.

Distribution of Preferences for the Proportion of English to Primary Language

Respondent Type/ Characteristics	Proportion of English to Primary Language						
	100 / 0	75 / 25	50 / 50	25 / 75	0 / 100	Don't Know	No Reply
All Respondents	14.7	46.8	33.2	1.5	0.4	1.8	1.6
Pupils	15.9	47.6	34.9	1.2	0.5	0	0
Program Teachers	13.9	36.5	40.3	2.8	0	4.2	2.4
Program Aides	6.3	43.8	42.9	2.1	0.4	1.3	3.3
Non-Program Teachers	26.1	53.1	15.9	0	0	2.4	2.4
Resource Teachers	12.5	37.5	40.0	0	0	2.5	7.5
Administrators	4.2	36.5	30.6	2.1	0	12.5	4.2
Program Parents	12.9	52.7	31.8	1.5	0.7	0	0.5
Community Members	21.3	46.4	26.4	1.3	0.4	2.6	1.7
First Language/Group							
Amerindian	8.6	82.8	8.6	0	0	0	0
Han	11.0	39.0	43.9	1.2	0	2.4	2.4
Other European*	22.0	41.8	25.3	4.4	0	4.4	2.2
MidEast/African	16.7	75.0	8.3	0	0	0	0
Filipino	14.1	60.3	23.1	2.6	0	0	0
Indochinese	23.9	62.0	14.1	0	0	0	0
India/Pakistani	0	82.4	17.6	0	0	0	0
Pacific Territorial	12.5	75.0	0	12.5	0	0	0
Japanese	23.1	53.8	23.1	0	0	0	0
Korean	16.7	54.2	8.3	8.3	4.2	25.0	0
Spanish	10.7	44.1	40.2	1.9	0.4	1.0	1.7
English	20.1	44.5	29.5	0.5	0.3	3.3	1.9
Number of Languages Spoken							
Monolingual	17.7	45.3	32.1	1.4	0.8	1.7	1.0
Bilingual	12.7	48.2	34.1	1.5	0.2	1.3	1.9
Multilingual	16.8	44.0	31.7	1.9	0	4.2	1.3
Kind of Program							
Comprehensive Bilingual	10.1	40.3	43.3	1.8	0.5	2.5	1.5
BILP/Reg. Egnlish	24.7	49.8	17.2	0.5	0	5.1	2.8
Recent Arrival Ctrs.	10.5	52.6	26.3	10.5	0	0	0
Tutoring/Culture Ctrs.	17.6	74.5	5.9	0	0	2.1	0
Depart. Secondary	14.8	48.7	31.8	1.5	0.3	0.5	2.2
MultiResource Ctrs.	27.5	42.5	30.0	0	0	0	0
Language Continuum	13.6	75.0	9.1	2.3	0	0	0
Immersion	7.1	78.6	14.3	0	0	0	0
Elem. BILP/ESL	27.5	49.6	22.1	0.8	0	0	0
Secondary BILP/ESL	22.9	50.0	25.0	0	2.1	0	0
Team Teaching	11.1	50.0	33.3	5.6	0	0	0
ILP/Primary Language	4.2	83.3	8.3	0	0	0	0

*Excluding English and Spanish.

REVIEW OF TEST SCORE DIFFICULTIES

Development Associates, in collecting achievement data (tracking 10,121 students across three years, then converting raw scores to T-score values), found some potential problems. These were described to the project officer in the Legislative Analyst's Office and to the representative of the Research & Evaluation Office of the State Department of Education. Since at least some of the problems had possible applications to other research, the Research & Evaluation Office provided the following specialists to consider them and, if possible, offer solutions:

Richard Shavelson, UCLA
James Fulton, Research & Evaluation
Roy Gabriel, Northwest Educational Laboratory
William Padia, Research & Evaluation

Each of these consultants has long experience with tests and with converting raw scores to standard score values. Eliodoro Robles and Earl Jones represented the Development Associates research team.

The first aspect considered was that of the variations among the lowest and highest possible T-scores for the different tests, forms, levels, and grades. (See Attachment I.) Using the publishers' norming sample data, the formula utilized was:

(raw score minus test mean) divided by the
standard deviation equals z-score;
(z-score times 10) plus fifty equals T-score.

This is a common conversion formula and was recommended earlier by consultants. It is obvious from the information contained in Attachment I that this procedure does not produce T-scores that are totally standard across the tests, forms, levels, and grades. (The research had also tried two types of scale scores and normal curve equivalents and found that the relative differences remained much the same since, in one way or another, the test means and standard deviations were utilized in those calculations.) Conversations with personnel of the several test companies did not produce any information that solved the problem.

A second way of looking at the several tests/forms/levels/grades was to calculate an approximate difficulty factor. Dividing the test mean by the number of items in the test gives some indications of the relative differences in difficulty. (See the columns marked "dif. fac.") A scan of those columns shows some marked differences in difficulty. It also shows that the differences are as great among the levels of some tests, notably the CTBS/S English, as they are among the several tests.

Some of the differences in the difficulty factors occur when the same test is taken more than one year. Note particularly Levels

C, I, and IV of the CTBS/S. Apparently, the more difficult items are extremely difficult. Thus a child may be able to "get up to" the more difficult items the first year and so score relatively high. The second year, however, the additional items needed to rise proportionately are so difficult that many students (it would be expected that this would adversely affect LES and NES students) cannot answer enough of them correctly to maintain their positions relative to the previous year.

The basic assumption underlying the use of standard scores (including z-scores, T-scores, some types of scale scores, and normal curve equivalents) is that:

> A student working at approximately the same level of effort and being taught the appropriate materials at about the same level of instructional capacity, will have about the same standard score on the same subtest across time.

Limited and non-English speaking students, if and as they acquire more capacity with the English language, would be expected to raise their standard scores on an English language achievement test. Some changes can occur with any student depending upon certain conditions of testing, teaching, and learning. The data presented in Attachment I, however, seem to imply that some differences across time could be attributed to certain qualities of the tests themselves, not solely to conditions of teaching/learning/testing.

Development Associates, while converting the raw scores to T-scores (this process was done manually rather than by computer because of the low incidence of some tests/forms/levels/grades represented in the sample), had found some groups of students that appeared to show large declines. In preparation for the meeting with the special panel, Development Associates had the computer search for those students with declines of 10 points or more and identify them (each printout contained a relatively large number of listings but most of them were "isolates," that is, there would be only one or two instances within a class). Several classes, however, had enough so that they merited investigation.

Attachment II contains most of those classes (the classes are not complete since the students with no score or only one year's score could not be compared across time and thus were eliminated to simplify the presentation) that contained several individuals that declined substantially. The remaining students' raw scores, grade equivalencies, and T-scores for the reading subtest, and the level of the CTBS/S taken each year, are displayed. Additionally, the comments of the teachers are provided.

In none of these classes is the decline universal for the students; some remain the same, some increase. In most of the classes, though, the total amount of decline is greater than the total

amount of increase. This would make it appear that at least a portion of the declines is a function of the tests. However, note that some declines were registered when the same level was taken two years successively (see especially the 4th graders in class 2, class 8, and class 9). In the cited cases, students took the CTBS/S, Level I, for two years. That means that exactly the same items were tested twice (when the same test is used for more than one year, the test mean is higher for each successive year, and a student must answer more items correctly to move from one grade equivalency to the next one). The evidence from this provisional information on nine classes does not clearly establish test influence on T-scores although it suggests that some differences may be involved.

The computer search showed that five other classes had serious declines - most of the students declined. Teachers and test coordinators were contacted to determine why these had occurred. In two of the five, the school had mis-coded the tests; when the correct test conversions were used, the declines mostly disappeared. Some classes presented other problems. In one, the teacher was alleged to have translated the items from English to Cantonese in 1979. In a similar case, the teacher translated the items from English to Spanish. Development Associates removed the scores for the translated tests from the records of those students. Another case could not be resolved and the scores were dropped from the analyses.

The Special Panel members then recommended that Development Associates obtain the distributions of the scores by test/form/level/grade to determine whether these differed significantly for the students in this study sample. Two possibilities were discussed: 1. if they did differ significantly, the analyses would have to be performed and reported separately; 2. if they did not differ significantly, they could still be aggregated but appropriate cautions would have to be stated.

Development Associates produced the score distributions. A few were represented by so few scores that they could not be compared meaningfully: Science Research Associates grades 5 and 6; Metropolitan Achievement Test grade 3; CTBS/Q grade 2; and California Achievement Test, form A, grade 3. In addition, the separations left a number of students tested with a level that was inappropriate for the grade; these, too, were not of sufficient number for analysis.

The nine sets of Spanish CTBS/S scores were compared through frequency distributions and correlation analyses (norms are provided only through grade 8; only a few 10th, 11th, and 12th graders took the test and they were aggregated with the 9th grade to form a "secondary" group). Although two of the means were significantly different from the others (not the "secondary" that might have been expected since the T-scores were calculated on 8th grade norms), the distributions were not different. They were different from the English CTBS/S, however, and the scattergrams showed fewer at the low end and less negative skewing at the high end. No

difference was found between the Spanish CTBS/S and the English SAT scores. Only 241 students have both English and Spanish scores for reading and/or mathematics in the same year; those scores were highly correlated (.82 to .91) although four of the means (5th through 8th grades) were higher for Spanish than for English. Development Associates had planned to analyze the Spanish scores separately from the English for all variables. The only Spanish/English comparisons planned were the correlations between scores for those students with both. No unusual distortions are thus seen from the different levels and it was recommended that the planned analyses be carried out.

The analyses among the English CTBS/S distributions showed only one significant difference: the 3rd grade was different from the 4th with more low scores at the lower end of the latter and more negative skewing at the upper end. Some of this had appeared in the sample cases displayed in Attachment II. Both grades took Level I, thus a difference would not be expected. Aggregating all students that took Level I, regardless of grade, and comparing them with those that took Levels C and II showed no significant differences. Development Associates has no explanation for the 3rd/4th grade difference but found it difficult to attribute the variations to the tests.

Examinations of the several levels within the CAT/B, the CAT/C, MAT (P-I and P-II only), and the SAT were done. The levels were not different within each test.

The appropriate levels/grades of the SAT were different, however, from those of the CAT/C, MAT, and CTBS/S. (The SAT was exclusively at one district and administered to grades 1-6 only.) The SAT means were higher for grades 3-6 and there was less negative skewing in the pattern presented by the higher scores. An examination of the T-score ranges and the difficulty factors shown in Attachment I does not present clearcut evidence for these test differences. No significant difference was found between CAT/B and SAT levels for the two in which both appeared.

Development Associates then examined the characteristics of the pupils and programs of the affected districts to determine if any of these could account for the differences in distributions. While absolute statistical comparisons could not be made at that stage, it appeared that the SAT district's classes had a higher proportion of students whose first language was English and students that were fluent in English. Teacher turnover had been low in the CAT/B and SAT districts. In both districts, the programs were reported to have been stable across the last several years. Somewhat less student mobility was also reported for the two.

It seemed prudent for Development Associates to perform some separate analyses of the SAT T-scores by the several variables that differentiate among the student characteristics and the instructional components to determine if the direction of these

was similar to or distinct from the results of calculating those with CTBS/S. Those analyses were done but the SAT results differed as much by English fluency, socioeconomic status, student status, and several of the instructional practices as did those from the CTBS/S. The results from the different tests were aggregated in the report.

Finally, Development Associates must point out that the CTBS/S scores were seven times those of all the other test scores combined and that therefore some of the comparisons discussed are not as "clean" as would be desired. For example, comparing 604 CTBS/S Level C distributions to 27 CAT/B is a somewhat dubious procedure. Most of the other test numbers were larger than the CAT/B but they were still small when contrasted with CTBS/S. That problem must be borne in mind when assessing the comparisons.

In conclusion, Development Associates emphasized that there were some important differences among the psychometric properties of the several tests represented in this investigation. Those differences could cause serious problems of aggregation across time when similar populations are being studied. The distributions of the students within the California LES/NES Study, however, varied considerably but the distributions of their T-scores, for the most part, were similar. With the exception of the SAT procedures suggested, Development Associates would expect that analyses by grade could be carried out with confidence. Determinations of changes across time, however, would have some potential problems and were not attempted.*

**Dr. Roy Gabriel produced a detailed review of these problems; with his permission, a copy can be sent to interested researchers.*

Attachment I: DISPLAY OF INFORMATION ABOUT THE TESTS/FORMS/LEVELS/GRADES INVOLVED IN THE CALIFORNIA LES/NES STUDY

Test/Level	Grade	Reading				Language				Mathematics			
		Highest T Score	Items in Test	Test Mean	Dif. Fac.	Highest T Score	Items in Test	Test Mean	Dif. Fac.	Highest T Score	Items in Test	Test Mean	Dif. Fac.
CTBS/S-B	1.7	63	84	59.4	.71	63	34	26.0	.76	66	53	33.9	.64
-C	1.7	76	74	32.7	.44	82	79	37.5	.47	85	53	22.3	.42
-C	2.7	61	74	53.9	.73	65	79	56.0	.70	85	53	35.7	.67
-I	2.7	78	85	35.2	.41	76	94	50.3	.53	82	98	40.7	.41
-I	3.7	68	85	48.3	.57	67	94	62.7	.66	66	98	64.0	.65
-I	4.7	64	85	58.3	.69	64	94	69.6	.74	61	98	75.3	.77
-II	4.7	74	85	42.7	.50	83	105	65.2	.62	77	98	49.6	.51
-II	5.7	68	85	51.7	.60	69	105	72.3	.69	69	98	61.4	.63
-II	6.7	65	85	57.9	.68	66	105	76.3	.73	65	98	68.4	.70
-III	6.7	73	85	44.9	.53	74	85	47.1	.55	76	98	47.8	.49
-III	7.7	69	85	49.4	.58	71	85	50.6	.60	70	98	55.1	.56
-III	8.7	65	85	55.3	.65	68	85	55.2	.65	65	98	62.7	.64
-IV	8.7	77	85	38.9	.45	76	85	45.0	.53	76	98	46.9	.48
-IV	9.7	73	85	43.5	.51	74	85	48.5	.57	70	98	53.8	.55
-IV	10.7	69	85	50.0	.58	71	85	54.0	.64	68	98	59.9	.61
-IV	11.7	67	85	55.1	.65	69	85	57.6	.68	66	98	64.5	.66
-IV	12.7	65	85	59.1	.70	69	85	60.2	.71	64	98	67.9	.69
SAT P -I	1	63	147	107.3	.73	69	63	43.6	.69	80	75	42.4	.57
-II	2	64	158	112.1	.71	72	87	60.0	.69	71	100	63.7	.64
-III	3	67	125	80.9	.65	72	95	59.4	.63	72	96	55.7	.58
-IV	4	72	127	71.4	.56	72	100	60.7	.61	73	112	62.4	.56
I -II	5/6	71	121	66.7	.55	74	100	59.8	.60	73	120	67.5	.56
CAT/A 2	3.6	63	85	63.9	.75	77	91	44.54	.49	64	117	91.96	.79
B 1	1.6	81	116	66.1	.57								
1	2.6	64	116	91.0	.78	68	73	49.6	.68	67	86	63.8	.74
1	3.6	66	85	58.3	.69	75	91	46.9	.52	70	117	78.6	.67
1	4.6	62	85	66.4	.78	68	91	57.4	.63	64	117	94.0	.80
CAT/C 11	1.8	66	60	40.0	.67					66	56	40.2	.72
12	2.8	63	71	51.1	.72	63	40	30.4	.76	65	66	47.4	.72
13	3.8	62	73	55.5	.76	64	46	33.7	.73	66	85	55.9	.66
14	4.8	65	70	44.1	.63	67	63	41.1	.65	69	85	50.5	.59
15	5.8	66	70	45.0	.64	68	63	41.5	.66	69	85	50.5	.59

Attachment II: Classes Which Had a Large Proportion of Students Whose Raw Scores Declined by Ten Points or More

	GR	PL	FST	READING 78 RS	GEQ	TS	READING 79 RS	GEQ	TS	READING 80 RS	GEQ	TS	Levels	Comments
Class 1	02	17	211				65	1.8	53	53	2.3	50	B-C	The 1st gr teacher believes scores represent the children's lrng. 2nd gr teacher says students whose scores declined learned as well or better than others whose scores went up or stayed the same. Teacher cannot recall any occurrance on test day that might cause difference.
			211				59	1.9	50	38	2.0	41	B-C	
			311				69	1.9	55		3.2	57	B-C	
			311				77	2.1	60	68	3.4	58	B-C	
			121				66	1.8	54	59	2.6	53	B-C	
			211				80	2.4	61	66	3.1	57	B-C	
			311				65	3.0	70	68	3.4	58	C-C	
			211				67	1.8	54	64	2.9	55	B-C	
			211				33	1.9	50	65	3.0	56	C-C	
		35	111				83	2.9	63	72	4.2	60	B-C	
			121				77	2.1	60	59	2.6	53	B-C	
		17	211				81	2.5	62	67	3.2	57	B-C	
		35	111				57	1.7	49	40	2.0	43	B-C	
			111				49	1.6	44	46	2.2	46	B-C	
		17	121				81	2.5	62	74	5.0	61	B-C	
			211				79	2.2	61	63	2.8	55	B-C	
		35	111				55	1.6	48	40	2.0	43	B-C	
Class 2	03	35	111	53	1.7	47	50	2.3	48	39	3.2	45	B-C-I	Generally same teacher comments as above. Many of these students had the above teachers in 1st and 2nd grades.
			111	72	1.9	57	71	4.0	59	71	5.5	61	B-C-I	
			111	56	1.7	48	69	3.6	58	60	4.3	56	B-C-I	
		17	121				60	2.7	53	39	3.2	45	C-I	
			211	77	2.1	60	69	3.6	58	57	4.2	54	B-C-I	
		35	111	69	1.9	55	76	6.7	60	76	6.7	64	B-I-I	
		17	121	69	1.9	55	42	2.1	44				B-C	

* *Explanation of Abbreviations:*
GR=grade; PL=primary language (under PL, 06-Cantonese, 17=Japanese, 28=Spanish, 35=English)
FST: F 1=fluent, 2=limited, 3=non; S 1= free lunch, 2=not; T 1=regular, 2=migrant, 3-special education
RS=raw score; GEQ=grade equivalency; TS=T score

Class 2 (continued from previous page)

GR	PL	FST	READING 78 RS	READING 78 GEQ	READING 78 TS	READING 79 RS	READING 79 GEQ	READING 79 TS	READING 80 RS	READING 80 GEQ	READING 80 TS	Levels	Comments
03	17	211	78	2.2	60	71	4.0	59	73	5.9	62	B-C-I	a continuation of the class on previous page
	28	111				72	4.3	60	70	5.4	61	C-I	
	17	211	79	2.2	61	74	5.0	61	68	5.1	60	B-C-I	
	35	111	77	2.1	60	66	3.1	57				B-C	
		111	77	2.1	60				77	7.1	64	B I	
04	17	211				57	2.5	52	42	3.4	42	C-I	
		211	77	2.1	60	48	2.2	47	22	2.0	31	B-C-I-	this student has learning/ emotional probs.
	35	111				77	7.1	64	76	6.8	59	I-I	
		111				65	4.7	58	71	5.6	57	I-I	
	17	211	58	2.6	52				75	1.4	59	C- I	
		121				40	3.3	46	67	5.0	55	I-I	
	35	111				41	3.3	46	57	4.2	49	I-I	Teacher generally agrees with the 1980 GEs.
		121				75	6.4	63	83	9.9	63	I-I	
	17	211				47	3.6	49	49	3.7	45	I-I	
	35	111	83	2.9	63	76	6.8	64	84	9.9	63	B-I-I	

Class 3

02	28	213				37	1.4	38	32	1.8	38	B-C	
		221				57	1.7	49	68	3.4	58	B-C	
	35	211				44	2.2	45	63	2.8	55	C-C	
	28	211				62	1.8	51	41	2.1	43	B-C	
	35	221				80	2.4	61	71	4.0	59	B-C	
		111				74	2.0	58	73	4.5	60	B-C	
		111				59	1.7	50	50	2.3	48	B-C	
		111				84	2.9	63	69	3.5	58	B-C	
		121				62	1.8	51	65	3.0	56	B-C	
		111				56	1.7	48	37	2.0	41	B-C	
		121				76	2.1	59	72	4.3	60	B-C	
	35	121				81	2.5	62	74		61	B-C	
	28	113				82	2.7	62	73	4.6	60	B-C	
	35	111				67	1.8	54	69	3.6	58	B-C	
	28	111				75	2.0	59	72	4.3	60	B-C	

	GR	PL	FST	READING 78 RS	READING 78 GEQ	READING 78 TS	READING 79 RS	READING 79 GEQ	READING 79 TS	READING 80 RS	READING 80 GEQ	READING 80 TS	Levels	Comments
Class 4	03	28	212	21	0.2	29				45	3.5	48	B I	
			211	24	0.4	31	26	1.7	35	32	2.8	35	B-C-I	-2nd gr. teacher
			222	24	0.4	31				11	1.3	31	B I	could not be
			222	16	0.1	26				23	2.0	37	B I	contacted for
		35	121	50	1.7	45	23	1.6	33	30	2.6	41	B-C-I	79 scores.
		28	221	27	0.5	32	20	1.4	32	48	3.7	50	B-C-I	
		35	121	23	0.3	30	28	1.7	36	26	2.2	39	B-C-I	
			111	33	1.2	36	11	0.6	27	28	2.4	40	B-C-I-	stu. has fam.prob.
			212	33	1.2	36	25	1.6	34	9	1.0	30	B-C-I-	absent alot
Class 7	03	35	212	22	0.3	30	29	1.8	37	24	2.1	38	B-C-I	
		35	112	72	1.9	57	24	1.6	34	22	2.0	37	B-C-I-	absent alot
		28	221	34	1.2	36	32	1.8	38	30	2.6	41	B-C-I	
		35	121	66	1.8	54	33	1.9	39	28	2.4	40	B-C-I-	an A student
			111				17	1.1	30	24	2.1	38	C-I	teacher says
			111	80	2.4	61	66	3.1	57	68	5.1	60	B-C-I	
			111				10	0.6	26	28	2.4	40	C-I	
		28	211	18	0.1	31	11	0.6	27	22	2.0	37	B-C-I	teacher says
			211	32	1.1	35	17	1.1	30	26	2.2	39	B-C-I	most in the
			211	23	0.3	30	15	0.6	29	31	2.7	41	B-C-I	class are "below
														grade"
Class 8	04	28	311				13	1.5	32	18	1.8	29	I-I	
			211				37	3.1	44	48	3.7	45	I-I	teacher
			211	15	0.6	29	26	2.3	39	30	2.6	35	C-I-I	generally
			111	29	1.8	37	59	4.3	55	78	7.5	60	C-I-I	agrees with
		06	111				46	3.6	49	66	4.8	54	I-I	1980 GEs.
			111				50	3.8	51	68	5.1	55	I-I	
		28	211	33	1.9	39	17	1.7	34	54	4.0	48	C-I-I	
			111	69	3.5	58				56	4.1	49	C I	
		35	111	18	1.2	31				56	4.1	49	C I	
			111	53	2.3	50	15	1.6	33	41	3.1	41	C-I-I-	teacher doesn't
		28	211	45	2.2	45	35	3.0	43	70	5.4	56	C-I-I	agree with this GE
	05	28	311				20	2.3	37	25	3.0	36	II-II	
			311				41	3.3	41	23	2.8	34	I-II	
		35	111	13	1.5	32	37	3.1	39	32	3.7	39	I-I-II	

DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

SUPPLEMENTAL TABLES RELATED TO PUPIL ACHIEVEMENT

The narrative report was prepared for a wide audience but the inclusion of all the analysis tables would have confused some issues. Consequently, those that are of importance to some researchers are included in this section. Although they are not referred to in the narrative, they are sequenced here in the order of the discussion in Chapter VI of *Volume I: Narrative*. Unless they were of special impact, tables that showed no significant ($p=.05$ or greater) differences were eliminated.

The analysis of variance procedure used the multiple regression approach, taking all the variables into account for the calculation of each. The stepwise approach to the regression analysis was used.

Distribution of Students by First Language/Language Group, Incidence of English Scores, Spanish Scores, and No Scores, and Distribution in Total Sample

	First Language/ Language Group	English Scores	Spanish Scores	No Scores	Total Scores	
		N	N	N	N	%
	Apache	7	0	2	9	.1
	Hoopa	7	0	2	9	.1
	Paiute	23	0	0	23	.2
	Pit River	42	0	3	45	.4
	Seminole	6	0	2	8	.1
	Tolowa	3	0	1	4	.0
	Wiyot	3	0	0	3	.0
	Yurok	11	0	0	11	.1
	Shoshone	10	0	1	11	.1
	Navajo	10	0	1	11	.1
	Hopi	5	1	0	6	.1
	Blackfoot	10	0	1	11	.1
	Wintu	3	0	1	4	.0
	Pomo	8	0	0	8	.1
	Wukachi	7	0	0	7	.1
	Washoe	6	0	0	6	.1
	Cherokee	20	0	0	20	.2
	Kewak	7	0	0	7	.1
	Sioux	9	2	0	11	.1
	Makah	3	0	0	3	.0
	Kekchi	6	0	1	7	.1
	Guarani	1	0	0	1	.0
	Metis	2	0	0	2	.0
	Klamath	1	0	0	1	.0
	Coro	2	1	0	3	.0
01	AMERINDIA	212	4	15	231	2.3
	Cantonese	531	3	177	711	6.9
	Mandarin	42	2	11	55	.5
	Suchow	9	0	1	10	.1
	Toishan	30	3	11	44	.4
	Fuchow	9	0	3	12	.1
	Hoiping	6	0	1	7	.1
	Chiu Jow	6	0	2	8	.1
	Hani	12	0	3	15	.1
	She	4	0	0	4	.0
	Hoinan	3	0	2	5	.0
	Hakka	9	0	0	9	.1
04	China	661	8	211	880	

Distribution (continued)

First Language/ Language Group	English Scores	Spanish Scores	No Scores	Total Scores	
	N	N	N	N	%
Arabic	10	0	4	14	.1
Farsi	30	1	6	37	.3
Hebrew	4	0	1	5	.0
Yiddish	2	0	0	2	.0
Amharic	4	0	1	5	.0
Swahili	1	0	0	1	.0
04 MIDEAST/AFRICA	51	1	12	64	.6
Ilocano	29	0	2	31	.3
Tagalog	129	18	44	191	1.9
Visayan	7	0	2	9	.1
Pampango	16	0	2	18	.2
Pangasinan	5	0	0	5	.0
Bicol	6	0	1	7	.1
Chabacano	7	1	0	8	.1
Ibanag	7	0	1	8	.1
Hiligaynon	9	0	0	9	.1
05 PHILIPPINES	216	19	52	287	2.8
Burmese	37	0	8	45	.4
Cambodian	20	0	8	28	.3
Laotian	27	0	7	34	.3
Thai	17	0	2	19	.2
Vietnamese	189	0	105	294	2.9
Mnona	10	0	4	14	.1
06 INDOCHINA	300	0	134	434	4.2
Hindi	19	0	1	20	.2
Panjabi	74	1	4	79	.8
Urdu	9	0	0	9	.1
Gujarati	3	0	0	3	.0
07 INDIA/PAKISTAN	105	1	5	111	1.1
Chamorro	3	0	1	4	.0
Samoan	23	1	2	26	.2
Trukese	1	0	1	2	.0
Tongan	3	0	0	3	.0
Marshalese	2	0	0	2	.0
Fijian	2	0	0	2	.0
08 PACIFIC TERRITORIES	34	1	4	39	.4

Distribution (continued)

First Language/ Language Group	English Scores	Spanish Scores	No Scores	Total Scores	
	N	N	N	N	%
17 JAPANESE	96	0	7	103	1.0
18 KOREAN	78	6	94	178	1.7
28 SPANISH	3430	1079	1722	6231	60.7
35 ENGLISH	946	86	339	1371	13.4
Armenian	69	2	11	82	.8
Euskara	7	1	1	9	.1
French	1	0	0	1	.0
German	3	0	2	5	.0
Greek	10	0	2	12	.1
Italian	10	2	1	13	.1
Portuguese	100	15	35	150	1.5
Russian	7	0	1	8	.1
Czech	4	0	2	6	.1
Turkish	4	0	0	4	.0
Polish	3	0	0	3	.0
Slovak	2	0	0	2	.0
Danish	3	0	0	3	.0
Dutch	0	0	1	1	.0
Swedish	2	0	0	2	.0
Gaelic	2	0	0	2	.0
Norwegian	2	0	0	2	.0
Magyar	6	0	0	6	.1
Croatian	2	0	0	2	.0
Flemish	3	0	0	3	.0
Finnish	4	0	0	4	.0
Welsh	2	0	0	2	.0
Romanian	2	0	0	2	.0
Galician	3	0	0	3	.0
03 OTHER EUROPE	250	20	56	326	3.2
0 NOT SPECIFIED	0	0	7	7	.1
TOTALS (% of Total Sample)	6377 62.1%	1232 12.0%	2653 25.9%	10,262	100.0%

Mean 1980 English Achievement T-Scores by First Language Group and English Fluency

First Language Group	Reading						Language						Mathematics					
	Fluent		Limited		Non		Fluent		Limited		Non		Fluent		Limited		Non	
	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean
Amerindian	160	54.0	48	47.8	2	45.0	100	53.2	42	45.5	1	40.0	156	53.9	47	48.9	1	54.0
China	124	51.0	265	45.6	208	43.3	56	55.3	208	46.9	169	41.1	125	56.9	280	53.6	190	50.8
MidEast/Africa	6	49.3	27	47.4	13	35.8	2	41.0	17	44.0	11	34.5	6	48.7	24	46.4	12	36.3
Philippines	33	49.8	117	48.2	42	36.2	26	49.8	92	44.5	38	36.4	34	51.1	112	49.7	38	42.3
Indochina	15	45.1	103	44.1	161	36.5	5	41.0	76	41.9	86	34.7	15	52.9	99	49.1	127	44.7
India/Pakistan	24	57.5	59	48.7	20	38.5	24	55.9	56	46.3	18	37.0	24	57.5	57	48.7	19	41.7
Pacific Territories	9	47.2	19	46.3	4	46.0	4	50.3	16	45.2	2	39.5	9	50.9	19	49.6	3	58.0
Japan	25	56.7	54	55.1	12	58.2	20	57.8	49	55.9	4	60.3	24	56.2	53	58.2	14	59.6
Korea	20	57.7	36	49.1	14	42.2	2	52.0	11	49.2	4	45.3	20	61.4	35	56.7	15	52.0
Spanish	1002	57.2	1478	40.6	561	34.5	475	46.6	772	38.9	291	32.0	963	49.8	1298	44.1	423	38.7
English	824	51.3	43	43.2			612	51.3	30	44.0			798	52.1	43	44.8		
Other Europe	55	51.8	144	46.4	37	42.5	37	50.1	104	45.6	20	40.8	35	52.7	138	49.7	38	45.5

ANOVA Summary Table for the 1980 Reading and Mathematics Subtests of the English Achievement Test for the Important Variables

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Significance of F
Reading				
Covariates	88961.8	44480.9	517.0	.001
English Fluency	60221.8	60221.8	699.9	.001
Socioeconomics	16570.6	16570.6	192.6	.001
Main Effects	4694.2	938.8	10.9	.001
Reading Sequency	1001.0	500.5	5.8	.003
English Modeling	1403.2	701.6	8.2	.001
Mixing Languages	73.0	73.0	0.8	ns
2-Way Interactions	2615.5	326.9	3.8	.001
Rdg Seq/Eng Model	1306.0	326.5	3.8	.005
Rdg Seq/Mix Lang	152.2	76.1	0.9	ns
Eng Model/Mix Lang	612.6	306.3	3.6	.05
Mathematics				
Covariates	33810.4	16905.2	180.7	.001
English Fluency	25727.7	25727.7	275.0	.001
Socioeconomics	3476.7	3476.7	37.2	.001
Main Effects	2211.6	442.3	4.7	.001
Reading Sequence	459.6	229.8	2.5	ns
English Modeling	312.6	156.3	1.7	ns
Mixing Languages	216.5	216.5	2.3	ns
2-Way Interactions	3872.8	484.1	5.2	.001
Rdg Seq/Eng Model	1447.9	362.0	3.9	.004
Rdg Seq/Mix Lang	1280.0	640.0	6.8	.001
Eng Model/Mix Lang	914.9	457.4	4.9	.008

Summary of Multiple Regression Table for 1980 Reading and Mathematics Achievement by Important Variables: All Students

Variable	R Square	R Sq Change	Beta
	Reading		
English Fluency	.192	.192	-.43
Socioeconomics	.231	.039	.19
First Language	.264	.033	-.16
Reading Sequence	.291	.027	.12
Mixing Languages	.315	.024	-.06
Teacher English	.334	.019	-.07
Learning Time	.343	.009	-.07
English Modeling	.350	.007	-.01
	Mathematics		
English Fluency	.119	.119	-.33
First Language	.178	.059	-.25
Socioeconomics	.220	.042	.10
Reading Sequence	.249	.029	.08
Mixing Languages	.271	.022	-.02
Teacher English	.279	.008	-.02
Learning Time	.287	.008	.05
English Modeling	.293	.006	.01

Summary Multiple Regression Table for 1980 Reading and Language Achievement by Important Variables: Limited and Non-English Speaking Pupils Only

Variable	R Square	R Sq Change	Beta
	Reading		
English Fluency	.213	.213	-.28
First Language	.295	.082	-.21
Reading Sequence	.373	.078	.17
Socioeconomics	.449	.076	.17
Mixing Languages	.523	.074	-.12
Teacher English	.566	.043	-.05
English Modeling	.607	.041	.03
Learning Time	.633	.026	.03
	Language		
English Fluency	.224	.224	-.31
First Language	.306	.082	-.24
Reading Sequence	.383	.079	.22
Mixing Languages	.462	.079	-.08
Socioeconomics	.536	.074	.10
Teacher English	.588	.052	.06
English Modeling	.634	.046	-.09
Learning Time	.664	.030	.03

PROPRIETARY STATEMENT

Development Associates had requested ownership of all the instruments which follow and the Office of the Legislative Analyst is studying the provisions of California law related to proprietary interests.

Until a decision has been made, potential users must obtain express permission from Development Associates before incorporating these instruments into any other study.

Write: Adolfo Munoz, Vice President
Development Associates
693 Sutter St., 3rd Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

Telephone: (415) 776-0120

GENERAL INFORMATION INSTRUMENTS

A great deal of early information on the sample programs was needed to guide the formation of the rest of the study. The enormous range of possibilities of program implementation would have made the remaining instrumentation too voluminous for accurate analysis. To limit the data to the specifications existent in the samples, two guides were prepared and administered: 1. identification of the programs and 2. program characteristics guide.

While the guides were valuable in that task, some difficulties were encountered later. These were primarily due to differing opinions among district administrators, school officials, and teachers on the nature of the implementation. Nevertheless, an important result of the administration of these guides was that the researchers were better prepared for data collection. Additionally, the information suggested other sources of data that would have to be pursued. Too, the fact of disagreement about programs, in itself, led Development Associates to some important conclusions about bilingual education and other services to limited and non-English speaking students. General guides such as these are recommended for the beginning stages of such a study since they provide baselines from which the research procedures can be established and the other instruments formulated.

PROGRAM IDENTIFICATION GUIDE

This guide is to be completed during an interview with the LES/NES services administrator or his designate(s). The guide's purposes are to find out whether there is more than one program in the district, and identify it or them. This guide solicits only basic information about programs and will be followed by one or more Program Characteristics Guides.

An important facet of the California LES/NES Study is the identification, location, and description of the major programs within the sample districts. The present interview is to determine those within your district. After the preliminary identification is made, you may want other staff members to answer the detailed questions about the program.

Name of Chief LES/NES Administrator: _____

Title: _____ Office: _____

Location: _____ Phone ( ) _____

If interviewee other than chief administrator:

Name: _____ Title: _____

Location: _____ Phone ( ) _____

Other persons present and providing information for this guide:

Name: _____ Title: _____

Name: _____ Title: _____

Name: _____ Title: _____

A district can be said to have ONE program of services to LES/NES students if the general implementation characteristics are the same regardless of language, grade, school, or funding source. That is, if throughout the district, the approach or major thrust is the same, a district would have ONE program. However, if in your opinion the program differs substantially for some languages, grades, or schools, then the district would have more than one program of services to the LES/NES students. Think particularly about the ILPs or other arrangements that may cause the program to be different.

Do you consider the district to have ONE LES/NES program? Yes___ No___

If the answer is YES:

What name does the district give to the program? _____

_____

If the answer is YES, do ID 2, then one Program Characteristics Guide. If the answer was NO, continue below and do one ID 2 and one Program Characteristics Guide for each different program.

How many distinctly different programs does this district have? _____

Complete one form for EACH program that is different.

Please supply the following information, or tell me where I can find it, on EACH of the programs in the district:

[1] Program name/identification:_____

_____

If there are several schools in the sample from this district, hand the interviewee a list of the sample schools;

[2] Does this program exist in any of these sample schools? Yes__No__

[3] *If yes,* Which one(s)?_____

_____

[4] What grade(s)? *K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 All*

[5] For which language(s)? *1-Ara 2-Arm 3-Cam 4-Can 5-Cha 6-Far 7-Ger 8-Gre 9-Ilo 10-Jan 11-Kor 12-Lao 13-Man 14-Por 15-Pun 16-Rus 17-Sam 18-Spa 19-Tag 20-Tha 21-Vie. Other, specify*_____

_____

*If Chinese is named, specify Cantonese and/or Mandarin above or if other, here:*_____. *If Pilipino or Filipino is named, specify Ilocano and/or Tagalog above, Pilipino as the new language here:*___, *and/or specify others:*_____

_____

*If Native American (American Indian) is named, specify here if distinct languages:*_____

*or here if only general cultures taught:*_____.

Do you have any general comments about this program, other than very technical information (which will be asked on a separate form), that will help us understand the nature of this program? Yes__No__

[6]_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

*Interviewer notations:*_____

_____

_____

_____

PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS GUIDE

If interviewee different from the person that completed the ID guide,

*Interviewee*_____ *Title*_____

*Location*_____ *Phone ( )*_____

Program name/identification from ID 2 [1] _____

_____

Most programs have some implementation characteristics in common and some that are distinctive. It is important, then, that we list the MAJOR characteristics of this program, whether or not you feel they are different from some other program. To help us sort the data properly, we will ask questions about different components of a program. If your program has no specific items within a component, simply tell us so. If it does, please described them for us briefly. If you have a document that spells out the components in your program, we would appreciate a copy or the opportunity to study it.

*Document(s) provided, if any:*_____

_____

_____

Some programs have an official designation of their program as to its type, or it is understood that it is of a particular type.

[1] Is your program 1-facilitation, 2-transition, 3-maintenance, 4-enrichment in so far as its official designation is concerned or does it 5-have no designation or X-other _____.

Hand the interviewee the sheet Instructional Configuration Models, give time to read the five categories, after orienting:

[2] Listed here are five instructional models related to the usage of English and the primary language of the student. If one of these basically describes this program, please indicate it. If not, please tell me how this program differs. *1 2 3 4 5 X ( )*

Another way to categorize programs is via the AB 1329 instructional strategies. If this program fits one of those strategies, please so indicate. If not, please explain.

[3] This program should be listed as 1-partial bilingual, 2-full bilingual, 3-bilingual bicultural, 4-individual learning plan, X-none of these specifically. Explain:_____

_____

_____

Specific programs in a district may be funded by one or a combination of sources. Please indicate the source or sources of funding for this particular program:

[4] This program is funded through *1-Title I Regular, 2-Title I Migrant, 3-ESEA Title VII, 4-Title XIII (Indochinese Refugee), 5-SB 1641, 6-AB 2284, 7-AB 1329, 8-SB 90, 9-School Improvement Plan, 10-Impact Aid, 11-Local District, 12-Vocational, X-Other, specify*_____

INSTRUCTIONAL CONFIGURATION MODELS

1. Children are taught subject matter in English only. No primary language is used.

2. Children are taught subject matter in English but the primary language is used to facilitate understanding of concepts when necessary. Once English is understood, the primary language is dropped entirely.

3. Children are taught in the primary language only and English is taught as a second language. Once English is learned, subject matter shifts to English only.

4. Children are taught in the primary language only and English is taught as a second language. Once English is learned, subject matter shifts to English but the primary language is maintained through the use of one or two classes in literature, culture, or language arts in the primary language.

5. Children are taught within the primary language only and English is taught as a second language. Once English is learned, subject matter can be taught in both English and the primary language. Programs are designed to cover most instruction in the school.

Variations from these models or important specifications within one or more of them:

X. _____

Education literature uses a variety of terms to describe components of a program or of instruction. We are not interested in the terms per se but want to help descripe this program accurately. We will describe each one separately, give an example, and ask if there is something in this program, regarding each term, that should be listed. If this program has nothing specified about any of the terms, just answer "none." The terms are model, approach or strategy, process, method, and technique.

Model is usually reserved for a package that spells out the approach, process, methods, and/or techniques, and often provides the materials to be used in its implementation, e.g., Southwest Educational Development Laboratory English/Spanish First Grade Program.

[5] Does this program essentially follow 1-a model from another source that is easily identifiable as such, 2-a model developed locally, 3-a model that is partly from another source and partly developed locally, 4-no model is used. *If 1*, 2, 3-Name of the model: _____

_____

Source of the model: _____

_____

Approach or strategy is sometimes different from model but not always. When it is different, it usually applies to a fairly complex set of instructions about what and how to teach at a particular grade or for a subject matter such as the Rock 'n Roll program for oral/aural language development or the Language Continuum approach of the San Diego City Schools.

[6] Does this program essentially follow 1-an approach from another source that is easily identifiable as such, 2-an approach developed locally, 3-an approach that is partly from another source and partly developed locally, 4-no approach, as such, is used. *If 1-2-3-*Name of the approach: _____

_____

Source of the approach: _____

_____

Process is usually used to describe a set of teacher behaviors in instruction and/or classroom management, expected to produce a specific classroom climate or environment such as that espoused by Piaget.

[7] Does this program essentially follow 1-a process from another source that is easily identifiable as such, 2-a process developed locally, 3-a process that is partly from another source and partly developed locally, 4-no process, as such, is used. *If 1-2-3-*

Name of the approach: _____

_____

Source: _____

Method is generally a smaller unit within instruction, such as the discovery method, experimentation, word attack skills. Sometimes these are difficult to separate from techniques. Although we will ask about techniques separately, it doesn't matter if they are listed here also.
[8] What are the main methods utilized in this program?

a-_____

b-_____

c-_____

d-_____

e-_____

Techniques are ordinarily still more discrete and specific. Question-answer, story telling, memorizing the multiplication tables are some examples seen in the literature.
[9] What are the main techniques utilized in this program?

a-_____

b-_____

c-_____

d-_____

e-_____

[10] When teaching the English language, which of the following best describes the materials used:

1-text as the main instructional material
2-about half text and half other materials
3-mostly other materials but some use of text
4-entirely other materials and no text
X-other, specify_____

_____

[11] When teaching subject matter in English, which of the following describes the materials utilized:

1-text as the main instructional material
2-about half text and half other materials
3-mostly other materials but some use of text
4-entirely other materials and no text
X-other, specify_____

_____

Y-If this varies by grade, language, or subject matter, specify:

_____

Question [12] and [13] correspond to [10] and [11], about the use of materials in English, except that they are about the use of materials in the primary language(s). Spanish is asked first, if this program involves that language, because it is the most prevalent and because more textual materials are available in that language. Subsequently, the other languages are queried separately unless the interviewee indicates that the answers are the same for all other languages. In that case, one additional section can be completed, indicating ALL, and the information can be later coded for each language separately.

If Spanish is taught in this program, complete [12.18] and [13.18], otherwise, continue to the next primary language section [12.].

[12.18] When teaching the Spanish language, which of the following best describes the materials utilized:

1-text as the main instructional material
2-about half text and half other materials
3-mostly other materials but some use of text
4-entirely other materials and no text
5-no subject matter taught in Spanish
X-other, specify_____

_____

[13.18] When teaching subject matter in Spanish, which of the following best describes the materials utilized:

1-text as the main instructional material
2-about half text and half other materials
3-mostly other materials but some use of text
4-entirely other materials and no text

X-other, specify_____

_____

Y-If this varies by grade or subject, specify_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

If no other languages are utilized in this particular program, proceed to question [14]. If one or more other languages are taught, complete a separate section for each if the answers are different for the two previous questions. If in the opinion of the interviewee, the answers will be the same for all other languages, complete only one section and mark ALL.

The answers to the same two questions will be sought for each of the other primary languages utilized in this particular program if you are of the opinion that the answers are different by individual language. If, however, the answers are the same for all of them, only one section will be completed.

In your opinion, are the answers to the two questions on usage of materials the same for all other languages utilized in this particular program? Yes__No__

If YES, mark ALL. If NO, fill in language designation and complete one of these pages for each language.

[12.] *Language*_____When teaching the _____ language, which of the following best describes the materials utilized:

1-text as the main instructional material
2-about half text and half other materials
3-mostly other materials but some use of text
4-entirely other materials and no text

X-other, specify_____

_____

[13.] *Language*_____When teaching subject matter in the _____ language, which of the following best describes the materials utilized:

1-text as the main instructional material
2-about half text and half other materials
3-mostly other materials but some use of text
4-entirely other materials and no text
5-no subject matter taught in this language

X-other, specify_____

_____

Y-If this varies by grade or subject, specify_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Some programs use a variety of instructional materials other than the usual written materials such as texts, workbooks, other books, and work sheets. These may be tapes, TV, movies, slides, charts, objects, or others. Some of these are used as a general resource to vary the mode of instruction, supplement it, or add a further dimension to it. Others are *built into the system of instruction* and are, in effect, a mandated part of the teaching delivery.

[14] Does this program specifically use any of these materials in its teaching delivery? Yes__No__

If YES:

Please indicate what these are, their use, and grade if grade specific:

	Material	*Use*	
( )	_____	_____	*Gr* __
( )	_____	_____	*Gr* __
( )	_____	_____	*Gr* __
( )	_____	_____	*Gr* __
( )	_____	_____	*Gr* __
( )	_____	_____	*Gr* __
( )	_____	_____	*Gr* __

Some programs use art, crafts, and music both for themselves and also as a general part of instruction in language and culture.

[15] Does this program make a specific use of any one of these in a structured way in the teaching of language and/or culture?

Art: Yes__No__; *If YES*, Please describe: _____

_____

_____

Crafts: Yes__No__; *If YES*, Please describe: _____

_____

_____

Music: Yes__No__; *If YES*, Please describe: _____

_____

_____

Other: Yes__No__; *If YES*, Please name and describe: _____

_____

Some districts are able to adopt uniform procedures and instruments for certain tasks involved in their services to LES/NES children but others, because of external requirements, must use alternative procedures. We will therefore ask questions relating to this particular program only, at this time, and any others you have, separately.

[16] What English language proficiency instrument(s) is administered? for the following skill areas (if none, so state)?

1-Oral/aural English_____( )

2-Reading English_____( )

3-Written English_____( )

4-Mathematics in English_____( )

5-Other_____in English_____( )

_____in English_____( )

_____in English_____( )

6-If alternatives to testing in these skill areas are used, please describe:

_____

_____

_____

_____

7. What do you see as the strengths of the tests?_____

_____

_____

_____

8. What do you see as the weaknesses of the tests?_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

[17] Please describe any diagnostic/prescriptive testing in English, including any of the above that perform that function, by skill area:

1-Oral/aural_____( )

2-Reading_____( )

3-Writing_____( )

4-Mathematics_____( )

5-Other_____( )

_____( )

_____( )

6-If alternatives to standardized English diagnostic/prescriptive tests are used, please describe:

_____

_____

_____

_____

7-What do you see as the strengths of the tests?_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

8-What do you see as the weaknesses of these tests?_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

[18] Please list any proficiency tests administered in a primary language, giving the skill area, language or languages, name of the test or "locally developed" if that is the case:

1-Oral/aural: Language *Spa* Test _____ ( )

Language ___ Test _____ ( )

Language ___ Test _____ ( )

Language ___ Test _____ ( )

2-Reading: Language *Spa* Test _____ ( )

Language ___ Test _____ ( )

Language ___ Test _____ ( )

Language ___ Test _____ ( )

3-Writing: Language *Spa* Test _____ ( )

Language ___ Test _____ ( )

Language ___ Test _____ ( )

Language ___ Test _____ ( )

4-Mathematics: Lan. *Spa* Test _____ ( )

Language ___ Test _____ ( )

Language ___ Test _____ ( )

Language ___ Test _____ ( )

5-Other:

Skill _____ Language ___ Test _____ ( )

Skill _____ Language ___ Test _____ ( )

Skill _____ Language ___ Test _____ ( )

Skill _____ Language ___ Test _____ ( )

6-Please describe any alternatives used in this program to supply the information needed that would be provided by the proficiency tests:

_____

_____

_____

_____

7. What do you see as the strengths of this test or tests (Please discuss by separate language if they are different)?

Language_____Strengths_____

_____

_____

Language_____Strengths_____

_____

_____

Language_____Strengths_____

_____

_____

Language_____Strengths_____

_____

_____

3. What do you see as the weaknesses of this test or tests (Please discuss by separate language if they are different)?

Language_____Weaknesses_____

_____

_____

Language_____Weaknesses_____

_____

_____

Language_____Weaknesses_____

_____

_____

Language_____Weaknesses_____

_____

_____

[19] Please list any diagnostics tests administered in a primary language, giving the skill area, language or languages, name of the test or "locally developed" if that is the case:

1-Oral/aural: Language *Spa* Test _____ ( )

Language ____ Test _____ ( )

Language ____ Test _____ ( )

Language ____ Test _____ ( )

2-Reading: Language *Spa* Test _____ ( )

Language ____ Test _____ ( )

Language ____ Test _____ ( )

Language ____ Test _____ ( )

3-Writing: Language *Spa* Test _____ ( )

Language ____ Test _____ ( )

Language ____ Test _____ ( )

Language ____ Test _____ ( )

4-Mathematics: Lan. *Spa* Test _____ ( )

Language ____ Test _____ ( )

Language ____ Test _____ ( )

Language ____ Test _____ ( )

5-Other:

Skill _____ Language ____ Test _____ ( )

Skill _____ Language ____ Test _____ ( )

Skill _____ Language ____ Test _____ ( )

Skill _____ Language ____ Test _____ ( )

6-Please describe any alternatives used in this program to supply the information needed that would be provided by the diagnostic tests:

_____

_____

_____

_____

7. What do you see as the strengths of this test or tests (Please discuss by separate language if they are different)?

Language_____Strengths_____

_____

_____

Language_____Strengths_____

_____

_____

Language_____Strengths_____

_____

_____

Language_____

_____

_____

What do you see as the weaknesses of this test or tests (Please discuss by separate language if they are different)?

Language_____Weaknesses_____

_____

_____

Language_____Weaknesses_____

_____

_____

Language_____Weaknesses_____

_____

_____

Language_____Weaknesses_____

_____

_____

[20] In this program, what records are kept on individual students?

[21] What English achievement test or tests is administered in this program? If alternate testing years are in force, please describe.

7. What do you see as the strengths of this test or tests?

8. What do you see as the weaknesses of this test or tests?

[22] What primary language achievement test or tests is administered in this program? If alternate testing years are in force, please describe. If the test varies by language, please specify.

7. What do you see as the strengths of this test or tests?

8. What do you see as the weaknesses of this test or tests?

87

[26] Please give the approximate percentages of teachers in this program by type of certificate and waiver:

Bilingual Elementary_____% Bilingual Secondary_____%

Cross Cultural_____% Emergency Certificate_____%

Waiver_____%

Have you experienced difficulties in obtaining or retaining teachers for this program? Yes__No__

If YES: Please describe the difficulties:_____

[27] How many paid aides work in this program?____If the use of aides varies by program site, grade, or language, please describe:_____

What types of functions do they perform?_____

[28] Do parent/community volunteers work in the classes in this program? Yes__No__ *If YES:* How many hours per week would you estimate a volunteer or volunteers are working in each class?_____

If this varies by site, grade, or language, please describe:_____

What are their main functions?_____

[23] What is the instructor/pupil ratio in this program (Please count both the teacher and the aide as instructors but do not count the volunteers)?

____instructors per ___pupils

If there are variations among program sites, grades, or languages, please describe:_____

[24] What is the ratio among FES, LES, and NES pupils in the classes in this program? FES____% LES____% NES____%

If this varies by program site, grade, or language, please explain:

[25] Please indicate which of the following characteristics, or combinations of them, classify the students that make up the FES portion of the classes: *(Mark one or more as indicated.)*

___Bilingual/same ethnic group ___Monolingual/same ethnic group

___Bilingual/different group ___Monolingual/different group

Other, specify:_____

If this varies by site, grade, or language, please describe:_____

[29] Does this program make use of paid community liaison or social worker personnel? Yes__No__ *If YES:* How many?____ Does this person or persons work with a particular site, grade, or language? Yes__No__ *If YES:* Please describe:_____

_____

_____

What are their work functions?_____

_____

_____

[30] Are any counselors specifically assigned duties within this program? Yes__No__ *If YES:* How many?_____ What are their duties?

_____

_____

_____

_____

[31] Are there any supervisors specifically assigned duties within this program or do the regular school supervisory personnel also supervise this program? *Pro__Reg__ If specific to program:* How many?____ What are their functions?_____

_____

_____

_____

[32] Is there any other type of personnel assigned to this program? *If YES:* Please give the title, number, and function of each:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Some programs allot specific amounts of time to the major components of instruction, others leave this to the individual teacher to work out.

[33] In this particular program, are time allotments specified by the program or by the teacher? 1-Pro__ 2-Tea__

If by PROGRAM:

Please indicate the number of minutes per day for each of the skill areas for English, primary language, and the subject matter areas if applicable: *Use ( ) to show combinations.*

Skill Areas	*English*	*Primary Language*
Listening(aural)	3-____m/d	4-____m/d
Speaking(oral)	5-____m/d	6-____m/d
Reading	7-____m/d	8-____m/d
Writing	9-____m/d	10-____m/d
Mathematics	11-____m/d	12-____m/d
Other_____	____m/d	____m/d
_____	____m/d	____m/d
_____	____m/d	____m/d

If the time specifications are listed in some other way, please describe and give the specifications:

_____	____	____
_____	____	____
_____	____	____
_____	____	____
_____	____	____
_____	____	____

If the time allotments vary considerably by grade, please describe the variations:

_____

_____

_____

The descriptions of some programs include an element called intensity of instruction, other than the amount of time to be devoted to a skill or subject. This may include teacher/pupil interaction, teacher feedback, amount of recitation, and others. Other programs leave this to the teacher.

Does this program specify some facet of intensity of instruction or leave this to the teacher. 1-Pro____ 2-Tea___

If PROGRAM:

Please describe those that are specifically required by the program:

_____

Some programs set up an approximate proportion of time in which instructors direct their attention to - individuals - small groups - large groups - entire class; others leave this entirely to the teacher.

[34] Does this program give specific direction about instructor attention or does it leave it to the teacher? *1-Pro*___ *2-Tea*___

If PROGRAM:
Please indicate the approximate percentage of time expected for each (by grade or group of grades if it varies greatly):

Grade(s)	*% Ind.*	*% Small*	*% Large*	*% Class*
All	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

If the program has an arrangement other than this, please describe:

_____

_____

_____

_____

Although programs grow and improvements are made with experience, many persist over several years. Sometimes, of course, the modifications are major and the program essentially becomes a new program.

[35] Was there previously a substantially different bilingual program operating in this district prior to the beginning of the present?

Yes__No__ *If YES:* For how many years? ____

How many years has this present program operated (please count

1979-1980 as one of the years)? _____

Hand the interviewee the list of schools in the sample if there are several in the district. Mark the replies on that sheet or here as appropriate.

Please indicate how long the present program has operated in the sample schools and how long any previous program or programs were there: *Sch 1: Pres*___*Past*___*; Sch 2: Past*___*Past*___*;Sch 3: Pres*___*Past*___.

[35] Present and past program experience - supplement:

Sample School	Yrs Pres	Yrs Past
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		
7.		
8.		
9.		
10.		
11.		
12.		
13.		
14.		
15.		
16.		
17.		
18.		
19.		
20.		

[36] Does this program have its own special parent/community advisory committee (1-), functions under the general district committee (2-), or functions under individual school committees (3-)?

How often does the committee meet?_____

What are the functions of the committee?_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

[37] Does this program operate a summer session or special summer program and if so, how often?

No__Every year__Some years__ If more than one is offered,

please describe each briefly:_____

_____

_____

_____

[38] Is there a bilingual vocational education component in this program? Yes__No__ *If YES:* Please describe:_____

_____

_____

_____

[39] How does this program relate or interface with the:

Mainstream program_____

_____

Compensatory education_____

_____

Economic Impact Aid Program: _____

_____

Other (name):_____

[40] If there are any things that are special about your English as a Second Language program or about the way it is operated in conjunction with or separate from the bilingual program, please describe:

[41] Are there any characteristics of this particular program that we have not covered in this set of questions? Yes__ No__ *If YES:*

Please describe:

[42] What do you consider to be the main strengths of this program?

[43] What do you consider to be the areas of improvement needed in this program?

[44] Are there any special difficulties or problems you encounter implementing this program that have not been discussed previously in this questionnaire? Yes__No__ *If YES:*

Please describe:_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

[45] Is inservice provided on a set schedule__or variable as needed__?

Who provides the inservice?_____

_____

_____

Do you have a specific arrangement with some agency or institution for the provision of other types of education? Yes__No__ *If YES:*

Institution_____What do they provide?____

_____

Institution_____What do they provide?____

_____

[46] How is formative evaluation done in this project and who provides that service?_____

_____

_____

[47] How is summative evaluation done in this project and who provides that service? *Same as 46___ (or) If different*_____

_____

_____

[48] Is there anything else about this program, its operation, or its general functioning that has not been covered in this interview that you feel should be noted? *Yes__No__ If YES:* Please describe:_____

_____

GUIDES SPECIFIC TO SAMPLE SCHOOLS

The services rendered to limited and non-English speaking pupils vary considerably among the schools of any district; socioeconomic conditions and language groups vary, and programmatic responses to them must necessarily be different. The administrator guide provided the orientation to the programs planned for each school. From that information, delineation of the instrumentation needs for the classrooms were derived. Two forms obtained the information on teacher and aide experience, preparation, and certification. A joint teacher/aide questionnaire obtained information on the implementation of the services in the sampled classes.

An opinionnaire on the functions and qualities of the advisory committees completed the school site information. This instrument sought factual information on the committees and respondent perceptions of their value.

Dis___Sc___Pr___Gr___
Cl___Id___Ty____
INT____DATE_____

LES/NES SERVICE QUESTIONNAIRE

(School Site Administrator/Coordinator/Director)

Development Associates is helping the State of California conduct a study of services to limited and non-English speaking students in its public schools. As a part of that study, it is important that we obtain your input into those services. Your name will not be used so you can answer without anyone knowing what you said.

---

[1] Title or position: _____

[2] Please provide data on the following as applicable:

(a) Organized bilingual classes by grade level

Total number of classes: _____

Grades	Primary Language Involved (No. of classes by language)	
_____	Lang: _____ ( )	Lang: _____ ( )
_____	Lang: _____ ( )	Lang: _____ ( )
_____	Lang: _____ ( )	Lang: _____ ( )

Number of Certificated Bilingual Teachers: _____

Number of Waivered Bilingual Teachers: _____

(b) ESL: Total number of classes: _____

Grades	No. of Classes	Primary Language Involved
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

[2] (c) ILP Program: Number of students involved_____

Grades	No. of Students	Primary Languages Involved
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

(d) Who is directly responsible for conducting the ILP program? (Name (s), and designation)

_____

_____

_____

[3] (a) Do you participate in implementing district policy for the staffing of classrooms in your bilingual/ESL programs: Yes_____ No_____

Comments, if any:_____

_____

_____

_____

(b) Do you have difficulties in hiring/retaining administrative staff and teachers for your bilingual program(s)? Yes_____ No_____

If yes, please explain:_____

_____

_____

_____

[4] Is the bilingual program in your school: 1-facilitation, 2-transition, 3-maintenance, 4-enrichment, insofar as its official designation is concerned, or does it 5-have no designation or x-other_____. (Please circle).

Administrator

Dis___Sc___Pr___Gr___
Cl___Id___Ty___
INT____DATE_____

[5] What school site bilingual activities are you involved in:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

[6] Is there any articulation of the bilingual program and entire school curriculum by the participation of project certificated personnel (including yourself) in:

	Yes	No
Department meetings	___	___
Revision of school curriculum and course offerings	___	___
Dissemination of program information	___	___
District-wide curriculum task force	___	___
Establishment of proficiency standards	___	___
Other	___	___

Comments, if any: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

[7] What methods are used in assessing the professional growth needs of bilingual staff in you school.

_____

_____

Comments, if any: _____

_____

[8] Do you have any staff development program? Yes No

If yes, please indicate with a (✔) whether or not the following inservice topics have been addressed?

_____ Classroom organization and management
_____ Cultural heritage of LES/NES students
_____ Bilingual lesson delivery approaches
_____ Second language instruction methodology
_____ Primary language instruction methodology
_____ Literacy skills
_____ Proficiency assessment
_____ Other

Comments, if any:_____

_____

[9] (a) Are there counseling services available to students in their primary language(s) Yes No

Comments:_____

_____

_____

(b) i) Do you have paid instructional aides for each bilingual class in your school? Yes No

ii) Do you have bilingual community aide services in your school? Yes No

iii) Do you have volunteer aides/parents in your bilingual program? Yes No

[10] (a) Do you have a bilingual advisory committee in your school?
Yes No

If yes, please list down by name and telephone numbers the members of the committees:

Name	Group Represented	Telephone Nos.

(b) How often does the committee meet:_____

(c) Please indicate the topics or program related activities coverd by meetings of the bilingual advisory committee.

_____

_____

_____

_____

(d) From your knowledge of community involvement in general, please give me the names of four community members -- two known to be in favor and two opposed to bilingual education:

In favor:

_____Tel:_____

_____Tel:_____

Opposed:

_____Tel:_____

_____Tel:_____

[11] Does the bilingual program in your school provide for parent education activities? Yes No

If yes, what are these activities:

_____

_____

_____

[12] Does your school have a basic plan for bilingual individual learning plans? Yes No

Comments, if any:

_____

_____

_____

_____

[13] (a) Do you have any procedure for monitoring student progress in your bilingual/ESL program? Yes No

Comments, if any:_____

_____

_____

_____

(b) Do you observe entry/exit criteria in your bilingual program? Yes No

[14] What dissemination techniques do you use in your bilingual program?

_____

_____

_____

_____

103

Dis___Sc___Pr___Gr___
Cl___Id___Ty___
INT___DATE_____

[15] How much cooperation do you receive from:

(a) District?

Very little or not at all	Slight Amount	Moderate Amount	A Great Deal
_____	_____	_____	_____

(b) Community?

Very little or not at all	Slight Amount	Moderate Amount	A Great Deal
_____	_____	_____	_____

[16] How useful for your own purposes are the bilingual program reports you are required to submit to local, state and federal authorities?

Not useful at all	Slightly useful	Moderately useful	Highly useful

Comments, if any:_____

_____

[17] Who does the formative and summative evaluation of your bilingual program?

Please describe:_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

[18] (a) What things would you mention to describe the strengths of your bilingual program?

_____

_____

_____

_____

[18] (b) The weaknesses:_____

_____

_____

_____

[19] On the overall, do you think that your bilingual program is meeting its goals?

Don't know/can't say _____
No _____
Partially _____
Successfully _____

[20] Finally, are there special aspects of your school bilingual program (other than funding) we have not discussed which we should know? Please explain, if any:

_____

_____

_____

_____

Dis___Sc___Pr___Gr___
Cl___Id___Ty___

INT___DATE_____

INSTRUCTOR TRAINING/INSERVICE ACTIVITIES

Administrator: Please list all inservice or other training for instructors in bilingual or ESL that was either provided or facilitated by the district or school for the instructional staff (teachers, paid or volunteer aides) from September 1, 1978 through August 31, 1979.

Name or Content	Organization conducting	Length in hours	Who Paid?	Participants (types)

DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

Dis___Sc___Pr___Gr___
Cl___Id___Ty___
INT___DATE_____

LES/NES SERVICES QUESTIONNAIRE

(Teacher)

Development Associates is helping the State of California conduct a study of services to limited and non-English speaking students in its public schools. As part of that study, it is important that we obtain your input into these services. Your name will not be used so you can answer without anyone knowing what you said.

(1) What grade(s) do you teach in this room?_____

(2) Please check below which best describes your class program

( ) Self contained
( ) Departmentalized
( ) Team teaching
( ) ILP (Individual Learning Plan)
( ) Combination of _____ _____
( ) Other

(3) What subjects do you teach?

_____ _____
_____ _____
_____ _____
_____ _____

(4) Total years of teaching experience (count 1979-80 as 1 year):_____

(5) How long have you taught in this district: _____
years

DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

Teacher

Dis___Sc___Pr___Gr___
Cl___Id___Ty___
INT___DATE_____

(6) Total years of teaching in bilingual/ESL programs (count 1979-80 as 1 year):_____

(7) What college degree(s) do you hold?_____

(8) Have you had special course(s) (which carried college or university credit) in bilingual/ESL subject areas? Yes_____ No_____

If yes, how many credit hours:_____

(9) How many bilingual/ESL related staff development activities did you participate in last year?_____

What institutions conducted them? District_____ Other (specify)_____

_____ _____

_____ _____

(10) Are you certified specifically as a bilingual/ESL teacher? Yes_____ No_____

(11) Please check which best describes your employment status:

( ) permanent (tenured)
( ) limited contract

111

110

DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

Dis___Sc___Pr___Gr___
Cl___Id___Ty___
INT_____DATE_____

LES/NES SERVICES QUESTIONNAIRE

(Aide)

Development Associates is helping the State of California conduct a study of services to limited and non-English speaking students in its public schools. As part of that study, it is important that we obtain your input into those services. Your name will not be used so you can answer without anyone knowing what you said.

[1] What grade(s) do you help teach in this room?

_____

[2] Please check below what best describes the class program in which you are involved.

( ) Self contained
( ) Departmentalized
( ) Team teaching
( ) ILP (Individual Learning Plan)
( ) Combination of_____ _____

_____

( ) Other

[3] (a) What subjects do you help teach?

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

(b) What other duties do you perform?_____

_____

_____

[4] Total years of instructional aide experience in bilingual/ESL programs (count 1979-80 as 1 year):_____

112

[5] How long have you been employed as an aide in this district:

_____
years

[6] How many hours of work per day do you spend in the class?

_____

[7] Do you hold a college degree? Yes No

If yes, what degree(s)_____

_____

If no, how many university credits do you have toward a degree?_____

[8[Do you hold a teaching certificate? Yes No

If so, what:_____

_____

[9] Have you had special course(s) in bilingual/ESL subject areas? Yes No

If yes, how many credit units:_____

[10] How many bilingual/ESL related staff development activities did you participate in last year?_____

What institutions conducted them? District_____

Other (specify)_____

_____ _____

_____ _____

[11] Please check which best describes your employment status:

( ) permanent
( ) temporary

[12] Do you identify yourself with any language groups? Yes No

If yes, what_____

Dis___Sc___Pr___Gr___
Cl___Id___Ty___
INT___DATE_____

LES/NES SERVICES QUESTIONNAIRE

(Joint: Teacher and Aide)

Development Associates is helping the State of California conduct a study of services to limited and non-English-speaking students in its public schools. As part of that study, it is important that we obtain your input into those services. Your names will not be used so you can answer without anyone knowing what you said.

(1) Is your class program 1-facilitation, 2-transition, 3-maintenance, 4-enrichment, insofar as its official designation is concerned or does it 5-have no designation, or x-other _____
(Please circle that which best describes the program).

(2) a) Do any students in your class have individual learning plans: Yes_____ No_____

b) If yes, how many by languages?

Language	Number of students
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

c) Who is directly responsible for conducting the ILPs? (Name(s) and designation)

(3) a) What assessment instruments are used to determine the English language proficiency of your students? _____

_____

b) What English diagnostic tests are used? _____

_____

c) What English achievement tests are used?_____

92 DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

Joint: Teacher and
Aide

Dis___Sc___Pr___Gr___
Cl___Id___Ty___
INT___DATE_____

d) Comments, if any about the above tests: _____

_____

_____

_____

(4) a) What assessment instruments are used to determine the degree of proficiency in primary language(s) of your students?

Name of Test	Primary Language
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

b) What diagnostic tests are used in the primary language(s)?

Name of Test	Primary Language
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

c) What achievement tests are used in the primary languages?

Name of Test	Primary Language
_____	_____
_____	_____

93 DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

Dis___Sc___Pr___Gr___
Cl___Id___Ty___
INT___DATE_____

Joint: Teacher and
Aide

d) Comments, if any on the above tests _____

_____

_____

_____

(5) Aside from language assessment instruments, what assessment instruments in English or primary language are used for the different content areas of instruction, e.g., Social Studies, Science, and Math.

Subject Area	Name of Tests
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

(6) a) When teaching the English language, which of the following best describes the material used: (Please circle)

1- text as the main instructional material
2- about half text and half other materials
3- mostly other materials but some use of text
4- entirely other materials and no text
x- other, specify _____.

b) When teaching the subject matter in English, which of the following best describes the materials used: (Please circle)

1- text as the main instructional material
2- about half text and half other materials
3- mostly other materials but some use of text
4- entirely other materials and no text
x- other, specify _____.

DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

Dis___Sc___Pr___Gr___
Cl___Id___Ty___
INT___DATE_____

Joint: teacher and aide

(7) a) When teaching the primary language, which of the following best describes the materials used: (Please circle)

1- text as the main instructional material
2- about half text and half other materials
3- mostly other materials but some use of text
4- entirely other materials and no text
5- primary language not taught
x- other, specify_____

b) When teaching subject matter in the primary language, which of the following best describes the materials used: (Please circle)

1- text as the main instructional material
2- about half text and half other materials
3- mostly other materials but some use of text
4- entirely other materials and no text
5- no subject matter taught in primary language
x- other, specify_____

(8) a) Which best describes the English materials used:

1- mainly commercially produced
2- half commercial and half locally produced
3- mostly locally produced materials
4- entirely locally produced materials

b) Which best describes the primary language materials used:

1- mainly commercially produced
2- half commercial and half locally produced
3- mostly locally produced materials
4- entirely locally produced materials

DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

Dis___Sc___Pr___Gr___
Cl___Id___Ty___
INT___DATE_____

Joint: teacher and aide

(9) Please indicate time allotments or number of minutes per day for each of the following areas

English Language Arts _____

Primary Language Arts _____

Content Subjects in English _____

Content Subjects in Primary Language _____

History and Culture _____

(10) How much is each of the following used to accommodate differences among your students?

	Not at all		Some extent			A great deal	
a. Personally tutor individual students	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b. Group students with similar problems or interests together	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c. Send students to multi-media learning lab or center	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d. Make individual reading, writing, math, etc. assignments	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
e. Use programmed material	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
f. Other (specify)_____	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

(11) What are the methods and techniques of instruction you have found to be the most effective?

_____ _____ _____

_____ _____ _____

DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

Joint: teacher and aide

Dis___Sc___Pr___Gr___
Cl___Id___Ty___
INT___DATE_____

(12) Do you receive instructional support from other sections or departments in your school?

Yes_____ No_____

If yes:	Very little or none at all	Slight help	Moderate help	A great deal
	_____	_____	_____	_____

Comments, if any: _____

_____

(13) What records are kept on individual students? _____

_____

(14) Do you observe entry/exit criteria among your students Yes_____ No_____

(15) a) What are the strengths of your class program? _____

_____

_____

b) What are the weaknesses of your class program? _____

_____

_____

(16) Are there some special aspects in your class program we have not discussed which we should know: Further comments if any: _____

_____

97 DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

Dis___Sc___Pr___Gr___
Cl___Id___Ty___
INT____DATE_____

LES/NES SERVICES
(Administrator and Member, Advisory Committee)

Development Associates is helping the State of California conduct a study of services to limited and non-English-speaking students in its public schools. This questionnaire will deal more specifically with the role of the School Bilingual Advisory Committee. It is important that we obtain your opinions on the subject. Your names will not be used so you can answer without anyone knowing what you said.

(1) Are you familiar with the bylaws or policies governing the establishment of the School Bilingual Advisory Committee? Yes_____ No_____

Comments, if any_____

_____

_____

(2) How would you rate the involvement of the advisory committee in:

	Very Little Or None at All	Moderate Amount	A Great Deal
a) Program planning	☐	☐	☐
b) Conducting the census and advising the staff on development of the bilingual program	☐	☐	☐
c) Program implementation (carrying it out)	☐	☐	☐
d) Making necessary program changes during the year	☐	☐	☐

98 DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

Dis___Sc___Pr___Gr___
Cl___Id___Ty___
INT___DATE_____

Administrator and
Member, Advisory
Committee

	Very Little Or None at All	Moderate Amount	A Great Deal
e) Evaluating the program (how will it meet objectives)	/ /	/ /	/ /
f) Other - e.g., stimulating public support	/ /	/ /	/ /

(3) Do you feel comfortable with the procedures and functions of the advisory committee?

Yes_____ No_____

Please explain_____

_____

_____

(4) Do you consider the bilingual program to be generally responsive to expressed needs or desires of the advisory committee?

Not very Responsive / / Somewhat Responsive / / Highly Responsive / /

(5) In general, do you think that the advisory committee is effective in its work?

Yes_____ No_____

Please explain_____

_____

_____

99 DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

Dis___Sc___Pr___Gr___
Cl___Id___Ty___
INT_____DATE_____

Administrator and
Member, Advisory
Committee

(6) Finally, how would you rate the value of the Advisory Committee in meeting the needs of bilingual education in the school? Would you say it has:

Little or No Value /___/ Moderate Value /___/ Very Valuable /___/

Please explain: _____

_____

_____

DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

LITERATURE REVIEW GUIDES

The initial scanning of bibliographies, abstracts, and ERIC citations showed the volume of literature to be huge and varied. Since the purposes of the many books, articles, and reports were very different, their review necessarily had to be systematized. This led to the preparation of three separate, although generally parallel, literature review guides: general treatises, research/evaluation reports, and composite materials. Specific instructions for their completion were included to assure comparison across sources.

Although a few materials did not fit easily into one of the categories, the system accomodated most. The use of such an organizational scheme is highly recommended from Development Associates' experience with literature search. With this or a similar unifying theme, even large numbers of materials may be controlled and the contents abstracted.

REVIEW OF PROMISING INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES FOR SERVICES TO LES/NES

Instructions

The thrust of this review is the identification and description of promising instructional practices for providing education to LES/NES pupils. This does NOT mean, however, that a practice must be exclusive to bilingual education, English as a Second Language, or primary language instruction. The practice must have been used in an educational program for LES/NES students. Thus ESL which was not used in teaching LES/NES students, K-12, would not be included. Teaching oral/aural Spanish within a bilingual setting would be reviewed. A program that used the Piagetian principles with K-12 LES/NES students would count. Similarly, programs to raise the self concept or improve the attitudes of LES/NES pupils should be reviewed. Spanish as a Second Language would not normally be included but if it were used to teach the FES component Spanish within a bilingual setting, it is worthwhile.

Research or evaluation that specifically measured (or is to measure) the results of bilingual education, is easy to identify. There are some others, however, that are less obvious: a specific strategy to identify promising practices, to specify characteristics related to effectiveness, or the treatment of scores on a test directly intended for bilingual instruction should be added. Reviews of tests, even though for bilingual pupils, if not related directly to instructional practices would not be included.

Remember that there are several elements in a program that may relate very directly to instruction, depending upon their application: counseling, parental involvement, community liaison, social work, staff development, team approaches, and others may or may not be specified as relating to instruction. Check them.

Be sure to use the Development Associates Style Guide for the bibliographic citations - no other format will be accepted. Print the authors' names and any other words that are unusual so there will be no need to go back to the source. Otherwise, write legibly and clearly; black ink is preferred. Submit all reviews to Dr. Robles.

Three categories of publications are arbitrarily separated: General Treatises on Promising Practices, Research/Evaluation, Composite Reviews. These are only to aid in their storage and in the preparation of the final review. Should something not fit one of these, use the form most appropriate and write across the top a label that describes it.

*When a publication clearly describes or deals with more than one instructional practice, add another form for each and simply note at the top, under bibliographic citation, * * *SEE POMFERT 1977 (for example), and put the extra sheet or sheets immediately following. Leave all other items blank through location; begin filling out the item that follows.*

Try to do the review within the spaces allotted since this is only a type of annotation. In unusual cases, add an extra white sheet.

REVIEW OF PROMISING INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES FOR SERVICES TO LES/NES

General Treatises describing Practices

Reviewer:_____ Date:_____
Bibliographic Citation:

_____

_____

_____

_____

Type of material: Article__, text__, proposal__, other, specify:

_____

Where is examined material located?_____
Described practice is listed as a model__, approach__, strategy__, process__, method__, technique__, activity__, combination of:

_____

Name of practice:_____

Brief description of practice:_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

134

Conditions under which practice is expected to function properly, if specified: _____

Evidence given for value of practice: _____

Special materials/equipment required to conduct practice: _____

Reviewer's comments: _____

(If publication describes more than one practice thoroughly, use a separate sheet for each.)

REVIEW OF PROMISING INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES FOR SERVICES TO LES/NES

Research/Evaluation

Reviewer_____Date_____

Bibliographic Citation:

_____

_____

_____

_____

Type of material: Article__, Text__, Proposal__, Other, specify:

_____

Where is examined material located?_____

Material is primarily: research__, evaluation__, other, specify:

_____

Purpose of the material:_____

_____

_____

_____

Specify instructional practices treated (complete section for each):

Name of practice:_____

Description:_____

_____

_____

_____

Brief description of study method(s):_____

_____

_____

_____

Major instruments used: Name_____

Standardized__, created__. Source:_____

Name_____

Standardized__, created__. Source:_____

Name: _____

Standardized__, created__. Source: _____

Name: _____

Standardized__, created__. Source: _____

Sample sizes: _____

_____

Summary of results: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Reviewer's comments: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

If more than one instructional practice is studied separately, rather than in combination, add another form.)

REVIEW OF PROMISING INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES FOR SERVICES TO LES/NES

Composite Reviews

Reviewer:_____ Date:_____

Bibliographic citation:

_____

_____

_____

_____

Type of material: Article__, text__, proposal__, other, specify:

_____

Where is examined material located?_____

Thrust of material: research methodology__, evaluation strategy__, reviews of research__, reviews of evaluation__, other, specify:

_____

Purpose(s) of the review:_____

_____

_____

Organize the description of the review according to the pertinent sections, giving (in order) major practices discussed, the way they were or are being studied, and evidence presented for effectiveness:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Reviewer's comments:

SPECIAL DATA GUIDES

A major concern of studies that require such massive efforts as the present research is the absolute control of the data - in this case, data on districts, schools, classrooms, instructors, and pupils. Development Associates therefore devised a thorough system for the assignment of research tasks, administration of instruments, reviews of those instruments, transformation of the data to computerized formats, and storage.

The forms on the following pages were essential to the high degree of data control and task completion achieved. Each step in the process was monitored by a special supervisor. This was equally important to the quality of the results. The system aided the many researchers in organizing their work, and it reduced the number of return trips for additional information, vitally important since the samples were scattered across the entire state.

The coding information, determined from the early program studies, gave maximum uniformity. The provisions for additions could be obtained only through one supervisor, thereby eliminating ambiguous inclusions. Fortuitously, the incorporation of even small details into the coding gave the opportunity for some unanticipated examinations of the data. For example, the many tests/forms/levels and the grades to which these were administered would have created substantial confounding of data had not the specifications been included for each individual student. The later analyses of the test scores by test/form/level/grade would have been impossible without this control.

Although all the researchers were bilingual or multilingual, unexpected languages were encountered in nearly every site. A formal guide requesting assistance, with the appropriate parameters given, allowed for maximum efficiency in the use of specialists' time. The provision of every needed language, effected throughout the study, materially improved the quality of the data.

INTERVIEWEE LISTS FOR SAMPLE SCHOOLS

The names on this list will be kept in strictest confidence. The list will be used only to prepare the identification numbers on the data lists and for reference when there are missing instruments. The names will not be associated in the computerization or in the reports with any student, teacher, aide, administrator, school, or district.

Surname	First	Location	Di 1,2	Sc 3,4	Pr 5,6	Gr 7,8	Cl 9,10	Id 11,12	Ty 13
								01	
								02	
								03	
								04	
								05	
								06	
								07	
								08	
								09	
								10	
								11	
								12	
								13	
								14	
								15	
								16	
								17	
								18	

continued on back

Surname	First	Middle or Initial	DI 1,2	Sc 3,4	Pr 5,6	Gr 7,8	Cl 9,10	Id 11,12	Ty 13
								19	1
								20	1
								21	1
								22	1
								23	1
								24	1
								25	1
								26	1
								27	1
								28	1
								29	1
								30	1
								31	1
								32	1
								33	1
								34	1
								35	1
								36	1
								37	1
								38	1
								39	1
								40	1

STUDENT LIST FOR SAMPLE CLASSES

The names on this list will be kept in strictest confidence. The list will be used only to prepare the identification numbers on the data lists and for referral when the achievement scores are being obtained. The names will not be associated in the computerization or in the reports with any student, teacher, aide, or administrator.

Surname	First	Middle or Initial	Di 1,2	Sc 3,4	Pr 5,6	Gr 7,8	Cl 9,10	Id 11,12	Ty 13
								01	1
								02	1
								03	1
								04	1
								05	1
								06	1
								07	1
								08	1
								09	1
								10	1
								11	1
								12	1
								13	1
								14	1
								15	1
								16	1
								17	1
								18	1

continued on back

Surname	First	Location	Di 1,2	Sc 3,4	Pr 5,6	Gr 7,8	Cl 9,10	Id 11,12	Ty 13
								19	
								20	
								21	
								22	
								23	
								24	
								25	
								26	
								27	
								28	
								29	
								30	
								31	
								32	
								33	
								34	
								35	
								36	
								37	
								38	
								39	
								40	

SAMPLE DATA RECORDING SHEET: ACHIEVEMENT SPRING 1978

Di 1,2	Sc 3,4	Pr 5,6	Gr 7,8	Cl 9,10	Id 11,12	TY 13	Pl 14,15	EP 16	SE 17	SS 18	Ø 19	8T 20	8 F 21	RRS 22-4	LRS 25-7	MRS 28-30	TBRS 31-3
					01	1											
					02	1											
					03	1											
					04	1											
					05	1											
					06	1											
					07	1											
					08	1											
					09	1											
					10	1											
					11	1											
					12	1											
					13	1											
					14	1											
					15	1											
					16	1											
					17	1											
					18	1											

Di 1,2	Sc 3,4	Pr 5,6	Gr 7,8	Cl 9,10	Id 11,12	Ty 13	Pl 14,15	EP 16	SE 17	SS 18	Ø 19	8T 20	&F 21	RRS 22-4	LRS 25-7	MRS 28-30	TBRS 31-3
					19	1											
					20	1											
					21	1											
					22	1											
					23	1											
					24	1											
					25	1											
					26	1											
					27	1											
					28	1											
					29	1											
					30	1											
					31	1											
					32	1											
					33	1											
					34	1											
					35	1											
					36	1											
					37	1											
					38	1											
					39	1											
					40	1											

CODE LISTS

Di = District: codes according to previous list.

Sc = School: codes according to previous list.

Pr = Program: 1=comprehensive/regular bilingual; 2=BILP/Regular English; 3=Newcomers; 4=Indian Ed Center Tutoring; 5. Junior High/High School departmentalized bilingual; 6=Multilingual resource center; 7=San Diego Classroom Language Continuum; 8=Immersion; 9=Elementary BILP & ESL B/S pullout; 10=Secondary BILP & ESL B/S pullout; 11=Team teaching - partial bilingual; 12=ILP/BILP with supplementary parent/child exercises.

Gr = Grade: 1 = 01 through 12; K = 13. For teachers/aides with multiple grade classes, code the lowest grade included; code students for actual grade. Do not code principals, resource teachers, bilingual directors/coordinators, community, parents, non program teachers.

Cl = Class: Numbered sequentially by school; all ILPs = 51.

Id = Identification: numbered sequentially per list/class/school.

Ty = Respondent Type: 1=student; 2=teacher in bilingual class or ESL; 3=paid aide in bilingual class or ESL: 4=teacher not in bilingual class or ESL: 5=advisory committee member; 6=resource teacher, supervisor, other assisting teachers; 7=principal, assistants, coordinator, director; 8=parent of sample child; 9=community member, not a parent in a bilingual or ESL class.

PL = Primary language: 1=Apache; 2=Arabic; 3=Armenian; 4=Burmese; 5=Cambodian; 6=Cantonese; 7=Chamorro (Guam); 8=Euskara (Basque); 9=Farsi (Persian); 10=French; 11=German; 12=Greek; 13=Hindi; 14=Hoopa; 15=Ilocano; 16=Italian; 17=Japanese; 18=Korean; 19=Laotian; 20=Mandarin; 21=Paiute; 22=Panjabi; 23=Pit River; 24=Portuguese; 25=Russian; 26=Samoan; 27=Seminole; 28=Spanish; 29=Tagalog; 30=Thai; 31=Tolowa; 32=Vietnamese; 33=Wiyot; 34=Yurok; 35=English; 36=Visayan (contact director for additional codes needed).

EP = English proficiency: FES=1; LES=2; NES=3 (code "fully bilingual" as FES).

SE = Socioeconomic status: 1=free lunch; 2=not (code partially free as 1).

SS = Student status: 1=regular; 2=migrant; 3=special education (3 takes precedence over 2).

8T, 9T, OT = Test designation: CTBS/S=1; ITBS=2; SAT=3; CAT=4; Spanish CTBS/S=5 (5 must be coded on a second sheet with CN (column 80) marked 2.

147

8F, 9F, OF = Test Level: CTBS/S (Spanish and English).

Do not record TOBE for K or 1.
1 = Level I
2 = Level II
3 = Level III

SAT:

Gather no data on kindergarten
1=Stan ford Early School Achievement Test
2=SAT Primary Level I
3=SAT Primary Level II
4=SAT Primary Level III
5=SAT Intermediate Level I
6=SAT Intermediate Level II
7=SAT Advanced Battery Level B
8=SAT Advanced Battery Level C

(Apply to director for codes on any other test levels.)

RRS = Reading raw score.

LRS = Language raw score.

MRS = Mathematics raw score.

TBRS = Total battery raw score.

REQUEST FOR LANGUAGE INTERVIEW ASSISTANCE

Dis_____Sc_____Int._____Date_____

Surname	First	MI	Address/Tel. No.	Primary Language (Pl)	Respondent Type (Ty)	Gr	Remarks	Date completed

DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

CHECKLIST FOR SCHOOL SITES

School Name _____ Code _____

Address _____ Telephone _____

Administrator _____ completed _____

Coordinator _____ _____

1. Teacher _____ _____

Aide _____ _____ joint _____

Student 1 _____ _____ Parent 1 _____ Tel: _____ _____

Student 2 _____ _____ Parent 2 _____ Tel: _____ _____

2. Teacher _____ _____

Aide _____ _____

Student 1 _____ _____ Parent 1 _____ Tel: _____ _____

Student 2 _____ _____ Parent 2 _____ Tel: _____ _____

3. Teacher _____ _____

Aide _____ _____

Student 1 _____ _____ Parent 1 _____ Tel: _____ _____

Student 2 _____ _____ Parent 2 _____ Tel: _____ _____

DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

4. Teacher _____ _____

Aide _____ _____

Student 1 _____ _____ Parent 1 _____ Tel: _____ _____

Student 2 _____ _____ Parent 2 _____ Tel: _____ _____

5. Teacher _____ _____

Aide _____ _____

Student 1 _____ _____ Parent 1 _____ Tel: _____ _____

Student 2 _____ _____ Parent 2 _____ Tel: _____ _____

6. Teacher _____ _____

Aide _____ _____

Student 1 _____ _____ Parent 1 _____ Tel: _____ _____

Student 2 _____ _____ Parent 2 _____ Tel: _____ _____

7. Teacher _____ _____

Aide _____ _____

Student 1 _____ _____ Parent 1 _____ Tel: _____ _____

Student 2 _____ _____ Parent 2 _____ Tel: _____ _____

8. Teacher_____ _____

Aide_____ _____

Student 1_____ _____ Parent 1_____ Tel:_____ _____

Student 2_____ _____ Parent 2_____ Tel:_____ _____

9. Teacher_____ _____

Aide_____ _____

Student 1_____ _____ Parent 1_____ Tel:_____ _____

Student 2_____ _____ Parent 2_____ Tel:_____ _____

10. Teacher_____ _____

Aide_____ _____

Student 1_____ _____ Parent 1_____ Tel:_____ _____

Student 2_____ _____ Parent 2_____ Tel:_____ _____

Four non bilingual teachers

1._____ _____

2._____ _____

3._____ _____

4._____ _____

DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

Community Questionnaires

In Favor:

1. _____ tel: _____ _____

2. _____ tel: _____ _____

Opposed:

1. _____ tel: _____ _____

2. _____ tel: _____ _____

Advisory Committee

1. Administrator _____ _____

2. _____ tel: _____ _____

3. _____ tel: _____ _____

CLASSROOM OBSERVATION GUIDE

Review of the literature, especially that on program implementation, demonstrated the necessity of studying instructional practices in the classrooms. The often contradictory information collected early in the research confirmed this need. After the study of many instruments, Development Associates selected a combination of measured properties and supplemental descriptions for its observation guide.

The guide generally proved to be very effective. In a few cases measurement problems were encountered because several instructors in the room were implementing different teaching/learning strategies. Return observations solved most of these difficulties.

It must be emphasized, however that the guide was created for use only by highly specialized observors who were experienced bilingual teachers, completely literate in the languages, and highly trained in the observation procedures. No one should use this guide unless possessing these requisite skills. In some cases, too, Development Associates would recommend that two observors be present for some of the tasks. Many returns were required because of multiple instructors, two or more instruction sites and the utilization of more than two languages in a room. Dual observors would be better able to capture the instruction in complex situations.

The imbalance between the instructional quality of teacher and aide, deficiencies on the part of each, made the measurement of some variables impossible. This was particularly the case for logicality and clearness of presentation, concrete to abstract progressions, and the configurations of demonstrations and action work. Although these have been found important for limited and non-English speaking students, they had to be abandoned in this research. Further specification of the procedures for measuring them must be made.

The instrument worked well for the remaining variables and those sections are recommended to evaluators and researchers. The resulting data clearly differentiated the instructional variations.

Dis___Sch___Pr___Gr_____Cl___ID____ Obs_____Date_____

OBSERVATION INSTRUMENT

Segment No. 1 2 3 4 5 6 SegBeg_____(InterBeg____InterEnd____)SegEnd_____ Time___

PART A

1. The subject matter for this segment was:

Tchr NA

Aide NA

2. % of segment actually spent on subject:

Tchr NA 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Aide NA 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

NA 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

3. Number of students:

w/tchr w/aide seat work out no/work total

4. Major direction of instruction was toward (check):

	Individual	Small Group	Large Gp/Class	
Tchr				NA
Aide				NA

5. % of students actually engaged in learning activity in this segment:

Tchr NA 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Aide NA 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Other NA 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

NA 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

6. % of students in direct learning interaction with instructors:

Tchr NA 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Aide NA 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Other NA 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

NA 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

7. This segment primarily was:

Language arts	Tchr	Aide	Subject Matter	Tchr	Aide
ESL language arts	OARW	OARW	ESL/		
Bilingual lang. arts	OARW	OARW	Bil/		
Reg.Eng.lang. arts	OARW	OARW	RegEng/		
Primary lang. arts	OARW	OARW	PriLang/		

8. % of segment languages used:

	Tchr	Aide
English	NA 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	NA 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Other	NA 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	NA 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Other	NA 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	NA 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

9. If student language usage was significantly different from above, describe:

10. If more than one language was used, were they in:

Totally structured format	10	Half structured/half casual	5
	9		4
Mostly structured/20% casual	8		3
	7	Mostly casual/about 20% structured	2
	6	No apparent structure	1

11. If more than one language was used, were they mixed in the same sentence? Yes__ No__

12. English language proficiency:

Tchr	NA 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Aide	NA 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Students	NA 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Note important errors/variations:

Tchr

Aide

Students

13. Primary language proficiency:

Tchr	NA 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Aide	NA 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Students	NA 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Note important errors/variations:

Tchr

Aide

Students

14. Briefly describe the classroom management:

_____

_____

_____ ( )

15. Briefly describe the specific instructor English modeling activities:

Pronunciation: _____

_____

_____

_____ ( )

Enunciation: _____

_____

_____ ( )

Syntax: _____

_____

_____ ( )

16. Briefly describe the specific instructor primary language modeling activities:

Pronunciation: _____

_____

_____

_____ ( )

Enunciation: _____

_____

_____

_____ ( )

Syntax: _____

_____

_____

_____ ( )

Dis___Sch___Pr___Gr_____Cl___ID____ Obs_____Date_____

PART B

(Entire Observation Period)

17. Check the one best descriptor if this observation or any part of it used any primary language:

Facilitation: brief translations of words or sentences	
Preview-review	
Simultaneous/concurrent	
Alternate languages within the day	
Alternate language by day or unit (ask teacher)	
Other	
Other	
	NA

18. Check any of the following used during the observation period:

	English	Primary Language
a. Drill		
Word attack/phonic/phonemic/syllable		
Word recognition/pronunciation		
Word substitution		
Vocabulary (with meanings)		
Phrases/sentences per se		
Syntactic (verb forms, pronouns, plurals, neg/pos)		
Other:		
Other:		
	NA	NA
b. Reading		
Individual aloud		
Groups aloud		
Choral		
Silent		
Other		
Other		
	NA	NA

c. Writing

Words only		
Sentences or longer		
Other		
Other		
	NA	NA

19. Describe the presentations of the subject/subject matter:

Logicality	
Clearness	
Concrete to abstract	
Demonstration/action work	

PART C

(Questions for the Teacher)

20. In so far as you know, were most of the LES/NES students in this class taught:

a. oral/aural primary language first _____

oral/aural English first _____

both at the same time _____

b. primary language reading first _____

English reading first _____

both at the same time _____

21. How was this observation period different from the usual class?

Not different _____ If different, describe: _____

_____

_____

22. What particular problems do you find in teaching this group of students:

No particular problems _____

Describe problems: _____

_____

_____

PART D

OBSERVER: Examine your class list and the students' characteristics. Comment on what you saw in light of the characteristics/situation.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Time total observation period began _____

Time total observation period ended _____

Elapsed time ____ minutes

Non-learning periods: (activity)	(minutes)
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
Total	_____ minutes

Elapsed time less non-learning time _____ minutes

Instructions for the Classroom Observation Instrument

Observer: Initial plainly in case there are questions that need answers later. Mark the date each segment was completed; mark the date for Part B when the entire observations was completed.

Use the same codes at the upper left as applied to the teacher or aide for the Joint Teacher Aide Questionnaire. If any changes have occurred, mark the same codes but add a narrative page explaining the change. Each of the items must be coded and each is a two digit code.

Circle the segment number in the sequence.

Enter the beginning and ending hour and minute; subtract to obtain the time. Use the intervening blanks only when the segment is interrupted beyond usual class occurrences. Subtract that time from the sequence. Calculate the total time elapsed for the segment. Each should be 10 minutes unless logicality demands less.

1. Enter a descriptive title for the subject matter the teacher and aide taught; mark NA if one of them did not teach. Include individual assistance as teaching.

2. All activities, including silent work, count in percent of time of segment used in teaching the subject. Any other activity is to be subtracted from the time. Calculate for the teacher and the aide if both are teaching (they need not be teaching the same subject). Calculate the combined percentage from the two as an average according to students involved.

3. Count the number of students from the beginning of the observation period for the total; count those for each segment by the categories. Add in students that return from out of the room during the segment. The sole purpose of this item is to help you calculate item 5.

4. Check the major direction of the teacher and the aide if either or both is teaching during any part of the segment.

5. The percentage for teacher, aide, and other (if needed, for example, work groups receiving no instruction from either the teacher or the aide, a parent volunteer, or other instructional grouping) that may occur during the segment, separately. Actually count the students; they may be interacting or silently participating. Reduce the percentage from the number of students that do no work, who do not pay attention, or who otherwise are not actually engaged in learning. Calculate the combined percentage as an average according to number of students.

166

6. Follow the same procedures for 6 as for 5 except in this case the student must be in some kind of direct interaction with the teacher, the aide, or some other instructional grouping. While the interaction need not be verbal, you must observe some type of interaction: going to the board to work a problem, nodding agreement, raising the hand to recite, turning to the page the teacher requests.

7. If the segment is a language arts subject, or if the teacher or aide incorporates language arts instruction within another subject, circle the one or more initials that apply: O=oral, A=aural, R=reading, W=writing. Remember that instruction about one of these, as well as students practicing, should be recorded. The right hand is for non-language arts subjects; enter the subject after the appropriate classification: ESL = English as a second language, Bil = bilingual, RegEng = regular English instruction, PriLang = instruction of the subject in the primary language. Check separately for teacher and aide. Note that even though a subject is being taught, language arts skills or knowledge may also be imparted, thus there may be coding on both sides.

8. Calculate the percentage of the languages used during the segment in the lesson and classroom management combined. Be sure to enter the name of the language after "other."

9. Describe in words any significantly different student usage from that of the teacher and/or aide.

10. Calculate the structured/casual proportions of the use of the two or more languages in combination. Mark NA if only one language was used.

11. Three or more mixed sentences qualifies for "yes." Remember that a translation, or use of a work in explanation, does not count as mixing, e.g., "The word is white, blanco in Spanish."

12. Enter evidence during the segment in the second portion, "Note important errors/variations:" Remember that accents and regional speech patterns, so long as they do not detract from the students' comprehension (not yours), do not enter into proficiency. Incorrect words, pronunciations, enunciation, grammar should be noted and must reduce the proficiency. Count words on the board or on materials used with the class. Errors during modeling are more severe than during regular speech. Errors with non-English speakers are more damaging than with those that are in the upper range of limited English speaking.

13. The procedures for the primary language are the same as for English in 12. Don't allow your personal perference in vocabulary to influence the calculations so long as they are explained or the students understand without explanation.

14. Use a few words to describe the classroom management as it relates to discipline, student movement; note detractions from learning if they occur. Rate 1-10 as with proficiency.

15. Note what the instructor specifically does for each of the categories to help the pupils learn. Note mistakes in these if they occur. At the right hand side of the last line for each category, calculate NA, 1 to 10, as with proficiency, for the modeling specifically carried out.

16. Same as 15 except the notations and calculations are for the primary language.

PARTS B, C, AND D ARE CALCULATED AFTER ALL THE SEGMENTS HAVE BEEN COMPLETED

17. Check only one. Remember this is your judgment, not that of the teacher, even though you must ask the teacher about events on other periods or days.

18. Check any or all in each category if they were used directly and pointedly during the observation period. Remember that they must be actual teaching activities, not incidental occurrences. Check for English and the primary language.

19. Use a few words to indicate the categories requested. In the blank at the right, mark NA or 0 to 10 according to the performance.

20. Check only one category in a and one in b.

21. Be brief but give the important points. If the teacher describes the day as very different from the usual, return and complete another observation. Mark this one, at the top of the first page, as the first observation and the repetition as the second. Attach a brief narrative page explaining the repetition.

22. Complete as described by the teacher.

PART D: Examine the student characteristics on your student characteristic section of the achievement data form. Consider the number of limited and non-English speaking students, the number of students in the class; note if the class is made up of more than one primary language. Then describe your impressions of the performance.

The time calculations in Part D include ALL the time from the beginning of your first observation segment until you have completed the forms and are ready to leave the class. The non-learning activities may be perfectly legitimate; going to the bathroom,

getting a drink, relaxation time in which no instruction is given, group transitions, recess.

IN ANY CASE IN WHICH THERE IS AN EVENT OR SERIES OF EVENTS THAT IS UNUSUAL, OVERT CONFLICT, PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTIC, OR ANY OTHER ITEM THAT SHOULD BE NOTED, ADD A NARRATIVE PAGE AND NOTE IT ON THE FRONT OF THE FIRST SEGMENT FORM. IF THESE APPEAR TO BE SO SEVERE THAT THEY INTERFERE SIGNIFICANTLY WITH THE LEARNING, MAKE THAT NOTATION. SOME OBSERVATIONS MAY NEED TO BE DELETED FROM THE SET FOR A PROGRAM IF THEY ARE WIDELY DIFFERENT FROM THE OTHERS. IF YOU BELIEVE AN OBSERVATION SHOULD BE DELETED, RECOMMEND THAT BUT INCLUDE THE FORMS IN THE PACKET. You may not delete an observation, only recommend it. Thus, be sure that your explanation is complete and clear. No action will be taken without consulting you. In case you decide to repeat an observation, turn in both forms. If the second is significantly different, note that fact in your narrative.

SATISFACTION GUIDES

The study of client satisfaction was an important part of this research. The carefully designed sampling provided a broad spectrum of persons associated with the instructional programs and the results were useful additions to knowledge about the services.

Likert type scales allowed for statistical analyses of clients' opinions. Explanations and comments provided descriptive material that aided the specification of the ratings. Both are required in this kind of survey.

Formal versions of the student and program parent opinionnaires were prepared in English, Spanish, Tagalog, Ilocano, Japanese, and Chinese. Unpublished forms were prepared in Portuguese, Pangasinan, Korean, Armenian, and Vietnamese. Interviewers spoke each language fluently. The high success rate for the completion of the sample and the quality of the information obtained were due to this attention to language.

The instruments for the community and the staff were in English but since these were nearly parallel to those for the other audiences, they could be administered in the other languages. That was necessary only on a few occasions.

The identification codes at the top of each instrument followed the same specifications for all others in this study. This uniformity was important to the cross referencing of results.

SATISFACTION OPINIONNAIRES

Instructions

Four separate opinionnaires comprise the instruments for the satisfaction study. One each for:

- *Students*
- *Parents of Students*
- *Staff Members*
- *Community Members*

The questions are set up to be computerized across all four instruments, therefore all the questions are numbered parallel. The student opinionnaire does not contain as many questions as the other three and the numbering is not consecutive. Translations are provided only for the parent and student instruments.

Be sure that rapport is established before beginning the questions. The brief statement at the beginning may not be enough for that purpose; explain in further detail when needed. You may restate any portion of the opinionnaire so long as you maintain the essence of the statements. Read all 5 scale responses each time.

Fill in the codes at the top of the page. Assign your own numbers to the code No.:___; they require numbers only so the pages of any one interview can be kept intact. The interviewees name should not appear on the opinionnaire.

When the students and parents have been selected for the sample, obtain the student's primary language and fill in the blanks in questions 8 and 9; question 10 should have the same response but please ask it anyway.

Note the alternatives in the following questions:

4: Use the appropriate gender [his/her].

4, 5, 8: If the student is enrolled only in ESL, not in any bilingual program, use the term English as a Second Language classes rather than bilingual classes.

None of these alternatives is needed for the staff or community opinionnaires. Similarly, the term primary language is to be used as printed instead of the name of the language for the staff and community opinionnaires.

Codes 6 and 7 on the Likert type scales are as follows:

6: I don't know.

7: No reply, refuse to respond, or other answer that is not undecided or I don't know.

Encourage the respondent to give a reply but do not attempt to force an answer.

All opinionnaires are to be turned in to Bob Ferrell for editing and storage.

Dis___Sc___Pr___Gr___
Cl___Id___Ty___
INT____DATE_____

LES/NES SERVICES OPINIONNAIRE
(Student)

Development Associates is helping the State of California conduct a study of its services to limited and non-English speaking students. As a part of that study, it is important that we obtain your opinions about those services. Your name will not be used so you can answer without anyone knowing what you said.

We have several statements we will read to you. On the first few, please indicate how you feel about the statement with one of the following replies:

1-totally disagree, 2-disagree, 3-neither agree nor disagree, 4-agree, 5-totally agree

Please feel free to ask any question you wish about a statement.

[1] I am satisfied with what the school is teaching me. *1 2 3 4 5 6 7*

Please explain your reasons:_____

_____

[2] It is important that Californians speak two or more languages. *1 2 3 4 5 6 7*

Please explain:_____

_____

[4] I am satisfied with my progress in the bilingual [or ESL] classes. *1 2 3 4 5 6 7*

Please explain:_____

_____

[5] I am satisfied with the way the bilingual [or ESL] classes are being taught. *1 2 3 4 5 6 7*

Please explain:_____

_____

DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

[6] I am satisfied with what the school is teaching about our cultures.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Please explain: _____

_____

On these last questions, I will give you some different choices after asking the question. Please choose the one you prefer: *(insert student's language in blank)*

[8] I prefer to be enrolled in bilingual education: 1-not at all, 2-only one year, 3-until fluent in English, 4-until fluent in English and _____, 5-all 12 years of school.

Please explain: _____

_____

[9] I prefer that my classes be taught: *(insert student's primary language in blank)*

1-100% in English 2-75% English 3-50% English 4-25% English 5- 0% English *6 7*
0% in _____ 25% _____ 50% _____ 75% _____ 100% _____

Please explain: _____

_____

[10] Student's primary language: Eng__, other_____

137 DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

Dis___Sc___Pr___Gr___
Cl___Id___Ty___
INT___DATE_____

CUESTIONARIO SOBRE SERVICIOS PARA LOS ESTUDIANTES DE HABLAR LIMITADO EN INGLÉS
(Estudiante)

La compañía Development Associates está ayudando al Estado de California en conducir un estudio de los servicios para los estudiantes de hablar limitado o de no hablar inglés. Como parte de este estudio, es importante obtener sus opiniones sobre estos servicios. Su nombre no se usará, así que puede contestar francamente porque otros no sabrán sus respuestas.

Leeré varias oraciones. En cuanto a las primeras, favor indicar su opinión sobre ellas, escogiendo una de estas respuestas:

1-Totalmente en desacuerdo, 2-En desacuerdo, 3-Ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo, 4-De acuerdo, 5-Totalmente de acuerdo

[1] Estoy satisfecho con lo que la escuela me está enseñando. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Favor explicar sus razones:_____

_____

[2] Es importante que los californianos hablan dos idiomas o más. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Favor explicar:_____

_____

[4] Estoy satisfecho con mi progreso en las clases bilingües [o de inglés como segundo idioma - ESL]. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Favor explicar:_____

_____

[5] Estoy satisfecho con la manera de que las clases bilingües [o de inglés como segundo idioma - ESL] se enseñan. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Favor explicar:_____

_____

177

176

138

DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

[6] Estoy satisfecho con lo que la escuela me está enseñando sobre nuestras culturas. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Favor explicar:_____

_____

En cuanto a estas últimas preguntas, daré otras alternativas para las respuestas después de cada una. Favor escoger la de que Ud. prefiere: *(Incluya el idioma del estudiante en los blancos.)*

[8] Prefiero estar matriculado en la educación bilingüe: 1-Nunca - No quiero estar en educación bilingüe, 2-Matriculado solamente un año, 3-Matriculado hasta hablar bien el inglés, 4-Matriculado hasta hablar bien el inglés y el español, 5-Todos los 12 años de la escuela. 6 7

Favor explicar:_____

_____

[9] Prefiero que enseñan mis clases: *(Incluya el idioma del estudiante en los blancos.)*

1-100% en inglés 2-75% inglés 3-50% inglés 4-25% inglés 5-0% inglés 6 7

0% español 25%_____ 50%_____ 75%_____ 100%_____

Favor explicar:_____

_____

[10] Idioma primario del estudiante: inglés _____ otro español _____

Dis___Sc___Pr___Gr___
Cl___Id___Ty___
INT___DATE_____

MGA PALATANUNGAN UKOL SA TULONG NA GINAGAWA PARA SA
MGA MAY KAUNTING KAALAMAN SA PAGSASALITA NG INGLES/HINDI
MAKAPAGSALITA NG INGLES (LES/NES)
(Para sa Mag-aaral)

Ang SAMAHANG PAGPAPAUNLAD (Development Associates) ay tumutulong sa Estado ng California na mapag-aralan ang ukol sa tulong na ginagawa nito para sa mga mag-aaral na hindi makapagsalita ng wikang Ingles. Bilang bahagi ng pag-aaral na ito, kailangan ang inyong mga kuro-kuro ukol sa mga tulong na ginagawang ito. Kayo ay malayang makasasagot sa mga katanungan sapagkat hindi mababanggit ang inyong pangalan.

Mayroong ilang pangungusap na babasahin sa inyo. Sa ilang nauuna, pakilagay ang inyong damdamin sa pangungusap sa pamamagitan ng isa sa mga sumusunod na kasagutan:

1-Salungat na salungat ako, 2- Salungat ako, 3-Marahil, 4-Sumasang-ayon,
5-Sinasang-ayunang lahat

Malaya kayong makapagtatanong ng tungkol sa mga pangungusap.

[1] Ako'y nasisiyahan sa ginagawang pagtuturo ng paaralan sa akin. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Pakipaliwanag ang iyong dahilan._____

_____

[2] Mahalaga sa bawat mga taga California na makapagsalita ng dalawa o higit pa sa dalawang wika. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Pakipaliwanag_____

_____

[4] Ako'y nasisiyahan sa aking kaunlaran sa klase ng Dalwika (o Ingles bilang pangalawang wika). 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Pakipaliwanag_____

_____

140 DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

[5] Ako'y nasisiyahan sa pamamaraan ng pagtuturo ng Dalwika (o Ingles bilang pangalawang wika). 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Pakipaliwanag_____

_____

[6] Ako'y nasisiyahan sa ginagawang pagtuturo ng paaralan ukol sa aming kalinangan. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Pakipaliwanag_____

_____

Sa mga huling katanungan, ako'y magbibigay sa inyo ng iba't-ibang mapagpipiliang kasagutan matapos ang katanungan. Pumili ng isa:

[8] Nais kong makapag-aral sa aralang Dalwika: 1-hindi na bale, 2-1 taon, 3-hanggang matutuhan ko ang wikang Ingles, 4-hanggang matutuhan ko ang wikang Ingles at_____, 5-sa lahat ng 12 baytang.

Pakipaliwanag_____

_____

[9] Nais kong sa aking klase ay magturo ng: (Ilagay ang nais na wika sa puwang)

1-100% Ingles 2-75% Ingles 3-50% Ingles 4-25% Ingles 5-0% Ingles

0%_____ 25%_____ 50%_____ 75%_____ 100%_____

Pakipaliwanag_____

_____

[10] Ano ang pangunahing wika ng bata: Ingles_____, Iba_____

141 DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

Dis___Sc___Pr___Gr___
Cl___Id___Ty____
INT____DATE_____

SALUDSUD MAIPANG-GEP ITI MAIT-ITED A TULONG
CADAGUITI SAAN A MACAPAGSA-O TI INGLES WENNO SAAN
UNAY A MACAPAGSA-O TI INGLES
(Para cadaguiti agad-adal)

Iti DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES tultulongan na iti estado ti California nga adalen ti mait-ited a tulong cadaguiti agad-adal a saan nga macasa-o ti Ingles. Cadua daytoy a pannagadal, masapul nga ammoen ti panunot mo wenno aniaman a cayat mo nga ibaga maipang-gep daguitoy a mait-ited a tulong. Ti nagan mo saan a ma-usar wenno maibaga. Daguiti sungbat mo ngarud, saan a ma-amuan ti sabsabali.

Adda sumagmamano a saludsud nga basaen mi kenca. Cadaguiti umuna a saludsud, ibagam no casano iti ricnam babaen daguiti sumaruno-a sungbat:

1) Saan-nac nga umayon a pulos 2) Saan-nac nga umayon 3) Saan co nga ammo wenno maibaga
4) Umayon-nac 5) Umayon-nac amin

Mabalin mo iti agsaludsud maipang-gep ti aniaman a maibasa kenca. Saan ca nga agam-amac.

[1] Ma-ayatanac ken capnecac iti isursuro ti pagadalan caniac. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Ibagam no sapay: _____

_____

[2] Masapul nga amin a taga California macasa-o ti dua wenno ad-adupay a pagsasa-o. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Ibagam mo sapay: _____

_____

[4] Ma-ayatanac ken capnecac iti pannagad-adal ken pannag-gungun-od co cadaguiti clasic a mangus-usar ti dua a pagasasa-o. (Wenno-ESL-Ingles a maicadua a pagsasa-o). 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Ibagam no sapay: _____

_____

142 DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

[5] Ma-ayatanac ken capnecac iti pannangi-sursuro da iti clase a mangus-usar ti dua a pagsasa-o. (Wenno ESL-Ingles a maicadua a pagsasa-o). 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Ibagam no sapay: _____

_____

[6] Ma-ayatanac ken capnecac ti isursuro ti pagadalan maipang-gep ti ug-ugali ken dadduma pay a nacairuamac. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Ibagam no sapay: _____

_____

Cadaguiti ma-udi a saludsud, ic-canca iti sumagmamano a pagpilian cada malpas ti saludsud. Ibagam iti pilim. *Icabil ti pagsasa-o ti agad-adal ti blanco.*

[8] Caycayatco ti agadal ken sumrec ti programa a mangus-usar ti dua a pagsasa-o:

1) Saan a pulos 2) Maysa a tawen lang 3) Agin-ganat macapagsa-o-ac a nala-ing ti Ingles
4) Agin-ganat macapagsa-o-ac a nala-ing ti Ingles ken _____
5) Amin a 12 nga tawen. 6 7

Ibagam no sapay: _____

_____

[9] Cayatco nga cadaguiti clasic, ti pannangisuro: *Icabil ti blanco ti pagsasa-o ti agad-adal.*

1) 100% Ingles 0%_____ 2) 75% Ingles 25%_____ 3) 50% Ingles 50%_____ 4) 25% Ingles 75%_____ 5) 0% Ingles 100%_____

Ibagam no sapay: _____

[10] Umuna a pagsasa-o ti agad-adal: Ingles _____ Dadduma _____

Dis__ Sc__ Pr__ Gr__
Cl__ Id__ Ty__
INT__ DATE__

英語の少しわかる人/英語のわからない人 質問書
(生徒)

加洲が英語の少しわかる生徒並びに全々わからない生徒のためのプログラムを研究するにディブロップメントアソシエーツが手伝っています。その一部として皆さんの意見を必要としています。
貴方の名前は必要ありません。それ故自由にお答え下さい。

此処に質問があります。最初の質問には下記の如くお答え下さい。

1ー全く反対 2ー反対 3ーきまらない 4ー賛成 5ー全く賛成

此等の質問に対してたずねたいことがありましたら自由にたずねて下さい。

(1) 私は学校で教えてくれていることに満足しています。 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
その理由を説明して下さい。_____

(2) 加洲に住んでいる人は二国語のそれ以上話せることが大事です。 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
その理由を説明して下さい。_____

(4) 二国語のクラスの進歩に私は満足しています。 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
その理由を説明して下さい。_____

(5) 私はこの二国語のクラスの教え方に満足しています。 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
その理由を説明して下さい。_____

DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

183

(6) 学校が私達の文化について教えて下さることに満足しています. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

その理由を説明して下さい. _____

_____

次の質問には各々ちがった答えがついています. その中の一つを えらんで答えて下さい.

(8) 私の二国語を勉強する希望は: 1ーいやです. 2ー1年間だけ 3ー英語を完全に話せるまで 4ー英語と日本語を完全に話せるまで 5ー12年間の学校

その理由を説明して下さい. _____

_____

(9) 私は次のように教えてほしいです.

1ー100パーセント英語 2ー75パーセント英語 3ー50パーセント英語 4ー25パーセント英語 5ー0パーセント英語
0パーセント日本語 25パーセント日本語 50パーセント日本語 75パーセント日本語 100パーセント日本語

その理由を説明して下さい. _____

_____

(10) 生徒の最初の国語: 英語_____, 日本語_____, その他_____

145 DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

Dis___Sc___Pr___Gr___
Cl___Id___Ty___
INT___DATE___

不會說英語或僅會說有限度英語而目前正接受英語訓練的學生本身意見調查表

STUDENT

本社(Development Associates)為協助改善加州政府所提供的專為不會說英語或僅會說有限度英語人士學習英語的服務計劃，特舉办此項意見調查。請您據實回答下列各項问題，但無需具名，回答時可圈選阿拉伯數字 1 2 3 4 5 以代表您不同程度的意見。

1 表示完全不同意。
2 表示不同意。
3 表示不能決定
4 表示同意。
5 表示完全同意。

請回答下列问題，如有不明瞭之處請提出詢问。

〔1〕我对学校给我的教育目前感滿意。

1 2 3 4 5

請解釋原因 _____

_____

_____

192

Chinese/Student: p. 1

[2] 每一個加州居民在會說兩种以上語言，我認為這是很重要的

1 2 3 4 5

請解釋 _____

_____

_____

[4] 我对自己在双語班或在學習英語為第二語言班中的進步感到滿意.

1 2 3 4 5

請解釋 _____

_____

_____

[5] 我对自己在双語班或在學習英語為第二語言班中的施教方式感滿意.

1 2 3 4 5

請解釋 _____

_____

_____

[6] 我对學校在日常教學中注意提及學生本身文化深感滿意.

1 2 3 4 5

請解釋 _____

_____

在下列最後幾項問題中，本社希望您在適当的答案中圈選一項，並在空格內填入你的母語

〔8〕我願意進入双語班或學習英語為第二語言班就讀

1 完全不要
2 最多一年
3 直到會說好英語為止
4 直到會說好英語及 _____
5 一直到十二年級高中畢業

請解釋原因 _____

_____

_____

〔9〕我願意在上課时，老師用 _____ (請在空格內填入何种語言) 教書

1 100% 英語，0% _____
2 75% 英語，25% _____
3 50% 英語，50% _____
4 25% 英語，75% _____
5 0% 英語，100% _____

請解釋 _____

_____

_____

〔10〕我的母語是：英語 _____ 或 _____

Dis__ Sc__ Pr__ Gr__
Cl__ Id__ Ty__
INT__ DATE__

Chinese/Student: p. 3

Dis___Sc___Pr___Gr___
Cl___Id___Ty___
INT___DATE_____

LES/NES SERVICES OPINIONNAIRE
(Program Parent)

Development Associates is helping the State of California conduct a study of its services to limited and non-English speaking students. As a part of that study, it is important that we obtain your opinions about those services. Your name will not be used so you can answer without anyone knowing what you said.

We have several statements we will read to you. On the first few, please indicate how you feel about the statement with one of the following replies:

1-totally disagree, 2-disagree, 3-neither agree nor disagree, 4-agree, 5-totally agree

Please feel free to ask any question you wish about a statement.

[1] I am satisfied with what the school is teaching my child. *1 2 3 4 5 6 7*

Please explain your reason:_____

_____

[2] It is important that Californians speak two or more languages. *1 2 3 4 5 6 7*

Please explain:_____

_____

The California Bilingual Bicultural Education Act of 1976 (AB 1329) provides that all school districts conduct a census of the number of limited and non-English speaking pupils (LES/NES) annually and that each LES/NES pupil must receive instruction in a language understandable to the pupil. Instruction must recognize the culture of the pupils. The law also requires community participation through advisory committees.

[3] I am satisfied with the provisions of the Bilingual Bicultural Education Act. *1 2 3 4 5 6 7*

Please explain:_____

_____

_____

149 DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

[4] Considering his [her] abilities, I am satisfied with my child's progress in the bilingual [or ESL] classes. *1 2 3 4 5 6 7*

Please explain: _____

_____

[5] I am satisfied with the way my child's bilingual [or ESL] classes are being taught. *1 2 3 4 5 6 7*

Please explain: _____

_____

[6] I am satisfied with what the school is teaching about our cultures. *1 2 3 4 5 6 7*

Please explain: _____

_____

[7] I am satisfied with the community participation in the bilingual program. *1 2 3 4 5 6 7*

Please explain: _____

_____

On these last questions, I will give you some different choices after asking each question. Please choose the one you prefer.

[8] I prefer that my child be enrolled in bilingual [or ESL] classes: 1-not at all, 2-only one year, 3-until fluent in English, 4-until fluent in English and 5-all 12 years of school. _____

Please explain: _____

_____

[9] I prefer that my child's classes be taught: *(insert language in blanks)*

1-100% in English 2-75% English 3-50% English 4-25% English 5- 0% English *6 7*

0% in _____ 25% _____ 50% _____ 75% _____ 100% _____

150 DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

Dis___Sc___Pr___Gr___
Cl___Id___Ty___
INT____DATE_____

Please explain:_____

_____

[10] What was the first language you learned as a child? *English*__*Other:*_____

[11] *If the answer to 10 was other than English:* Do you speak that language daily__, occasionally__, almost never__.

[12] *If the interview is in English, do not ask this question and mark YES for the answer:* Do you speak English? *Yes*__*No*__

[13] Do you speak any other language [*add...in addition to English if applicable and the language listed in 10 if applicable*]? *Yes*__*No*__

DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

Dis___Sc___Pr___Gr___
Cl___Id___Ty___
INT____DATE_____

CUESTIONARIO SOBRE SERVICIOS PARA LOS ESTUDIANTES DE HABLAR LIMITADO EN INGLES
(Padre)

La compañía Development Associates está ayudando al Estado de California en conducir un estudio de los servicios para los estudiantes de hablar limitado o de no hablar inglés. Como parte de este estudio, es importante obtener sus opiniones sobre estos servicios. Su nombre no se usará, así que puede contestar francamente porque otros no sabrán sus respuestas.

Leeré varias oraciones. En cuanto a las primeras, favor indicar su opinión sobre ellas, escogiendo una de estas respuestas:

1-Totalmente en desacuerdo, 2-En desacuerdo, 3- Ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo, 4-De acuerdo, 5-Totalmente de acuerdo

Favor sentirse libre de hacerme cualquier pregunta.

[1] Estoy satisfecho con lo que la escuela está enseñando a mi hijo. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Favor explicar sus razones:_____

_____

[2] Es importante que los californianos hablan dos idiomas o más. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Favor exlicar:_____

_____

La Ley Californiana de Educación Bilingüe y Bicultural de 1976 (AB 1320) requiere que todos los distritos escolares conduzcan un censo del número de estudiantes de limitado o no hablar inglés anualmente y que estos estudiantes deben recibir enseñanza en el idioma comprensible a ellos. La enseñanza debe reconocer la cultura de los estudiantes. La ley también requiere participación de la comunidad atravez de comités asesorios.

[3] Estoy satisfecho con estos requisitos de la ley. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Favor explicar:_____

_____

DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

[4] Tomando en cuenta sus habilidades, estoy satisfecho con el progreso de mi hijo en las clases bilingües [o inglés como segundo idioma-ESL]. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Favor explicar: _____

_____

[5] Estoy satisfecho con la manera de que se enseñan las clases bilingües [o de inglés como segundo idioma-ESL] de mi hijo. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Favor explicar: _____

_____

[6] Estoy satisfecho con lo que la escuela está enseñando sobre nuestras culturas. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Favor explicar: _____

_____

[7] Estoy satisfecho con la participación de la comunidad en el programa bilingüe. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Favor explicar: _____

_____

En el caso de estas últimas preguntas, daré diferentes alternativas. Favor indicar la que Ud. prefiere.

[8] Prefiero que mi hijo esté matriculado en clases bilingües: 1-Nunca-No quiero que esté en clases bilingües, 2-Matriculado solo un año, 3-Matriculado hasta hablar bien el inglés, 4-Matriculado hasta hablar bien el inglés y el español, 5-Matriculado todos los 12 años de la escuela. 6 7

Favor explicar: _____

_____

DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

Dis___Sc___Pr___Gr___
Cl___Id___Ty___
INT_____DATE_____

[9] Prefiero que las clases de mi hijo se enseñan: *(Incluya el idioma del estudiante en los blancos.)*

1-100% en inglés 2-75% inglés 3-50% inglés 4-25% inglés 5 0% inglés 6 7

0% español 25%_____ 50%_____ 75%_____ 100%_____

Favor explicar:_____

_____

[10] Cuál fue el primer idioma que Ud. aprendió como niño: inglés_____ español _____

[11] *Si la respuesta a 10 no fue inglés*: Habla Ud. aquel idioma diaramente_____, de vez en cuando_____, casi nunca_____.

[12] *Si la entrevista fue en inglés, no haga esta pregunta y marque sí para la respuesta:*

Habla Ud. inglés: Sí_____ No_____

[13] Habla Ud. otro idioma o idiomas [*agregue...además de inglés si aplica, y el idioma dado en 10*]?

Sí_____ No_____

DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

Dis___Sc___Pr___Gr___
Cl___Id___Ty___
INT_____DATE_____

MGA PALATANUNGAN UKOL SA TULONG NA GINAGAWA PARA SA MGA MAY KAUNTING KAALAMAN SA PAGSASALITA NG INGLES/HINDI MAKAPAGSALITA NG INGLES (LES/NES)
(Para sa Magulang ng Mag-aaral)

Ang SAMAHANG PAGPAPAUNLAD (Development Associates) ay tumutulong sa Estado ng California na mapag-aralan ang ukol sa tulong na ginagawa nito para sa mga mag-aaral na hindi makapagsalita ng wikang Ingles. Bilang bahagi ng pag-aaral na ito, kailangan ang inyong mga kuro-kuro ukol sa mga tulong na ginagawang ito. Kayo ay malayang makasasagot sa mga katanungan sapagkat hindi mababanggit ang inyong pangalan.

Mayroong ilang pangungusap na babasahin sa inyo. Sa ilang nauuna, pakilagay ang inyong damdamin sa pangungusap sa pamamagitan ng isa sa mga sumusunod na kasagutan:

1-Salungat na salungat ako, 2-Salungat ako, 3-Marahil, 4-Sumasang-ayon, 5-Sinasang-ayunang lahat

Malaya kayong makapagtatanong ng tungkol sa mga pangungusap.

[1] Ako'y nasisiyahan sa ginagawang pagtuturo ng paaralan sa aking anak. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Pakipaliwanag ang iyong dahilan. _____

_____

[2] Mahalaga sa bawat taga-California na makapagsalita ng dalawa o higit pa sa dalawang wika. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Pakipaliwanag_____

_____

Ang batas ukol sa Aralang Dalwika/Dal-linang (Bilingual/Bicultural Education) ng taong 1976 ng California (AB 1329) ay nagsasaad na kailangang malaman ng bawat purok paaralan ang bilang ng mga batang nag-aaral taon-taon na hindi makapagsalita ng Ingles at ang bawat batang ito ay dapat turuan sa wikang naliliwanagan ng mag-aaral. Sa pagtuturong ito ay kailangang malaman ang kalinangan ng mga mag-aaral. Ang batas ay nangangailangan ng pakikisama ng purok sa pamamagitan ng mga lupong tagapayo.

208

207

155

DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

[3] Ako'y nasisiyahan sa mga nilalaman ng batas sa Aralang Dalwika/ Dal-linang. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Pakipaliwanag_____

_____

[4] Batay sa kakayahan ng aking anak, ako ay nasisiyahan sa kanyang kaunlaran sa klaseng dalwika (o Ingles bilang pangalawang wika-ESL). 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Pakipaliwanag_____

_____

[5] Ako'y nasisiyahan sa ginagawang pamamaraang pagtuturo sa aking anak sa klaseng dalwika (o Ingles bilang pangalawang wika). 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Pakipaliwanag_____

_____

[6] Ako'y nasisiyahan sa ginagawang pagtuturo ng paaralan sa aming sariling kalinangan. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Pakipaliwanag_____

_____

[7] Ako'y nasisiyahan sa pakikipagtulungan ng purok sa palatuntunang dalwika. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Pakipaliwanag_____

_____

DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

Dis___Sc___Pr___Gr___
Cl___Id___Ty___
INT____DATE_____

Sa mga huling katanungan, bibigyan ko kayo ng iba't-ibang mapagpipiliang kasagutan pagkatapos ng bawat tanong. Piliin ang inyong kasagutan.

[8] Nais kong ang aking anak ay makapag-aral sa klaseng dalwika (o Ingles bilang Pangalawang wika). 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

1) hindi na bale, 2) 1 taon, 3) hanggang matutuhan ang wikang Ingles, 4) hanggang matutuhan ang wikang Ingles at_____, 5) sa lahat ng 12 baytang

Pakipaliwanag_____

_____

[9] Nais kong ang aking anak ay maturuan ng: (Ilagay ang nais na wika sa puwang)

1) 100% Ingles 2) 75% Ingles 3) 50% Ingles 4) 25% Ingles 5) 0% Ingles

0%_____ 25%_____ 50%_____ 75% _____ 100%_____

Pakipaliwanag_____

_____

[10] Ano ang unang wika na natutuhan ninyo noong kayo ay bata pa? Ingles_____ Iba_____

[11] *Kung ang kasagutan sa tanong bilang 10 ay iba sa wikang Ingles:* Sinasalita ba ninyo itong wikang ito araw-araw_____, paminsan-minsan_____, halos hindi kailanman_____.

[12] *Kung ang pakikipanayam ay sa Ingles, huwag na itong itanong at ilagay ang Oo bilang kasagutan:* Kayo ba ay nagsasalita ng Ingles? Oo_____ Hindi_____

[13] Nagsasalita ba kayo ng ibang wika? *Idagdag . . . bukod sa Ingles kung nararapat at ang wikang nasasaad sa 10 kung kailangan.* Oo_____ Hindi_____

212

211

DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

Dis___Sc___Pr___Gr___
Cl___Id___Ty___

INT___DATE_____

SALUDSUD MAIPANG-GEP ITI MAIT-ITED A TULONG
CADAGUITI SAAN A MACAPAGSA-O TI INGLES WENNO
SAAN UNAY A MACAPAGSA-O TI INGLES

(Para cadaguiti nagan-nac ti agad-adal)

Iti DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES tultulongan na iti estado ti California nga adalen ti mait-ited a tulong cadaguiti agad-adal a saan nga macasa-o ti Ingles. Cadua daytoy a pannagadal, masapul nga ammoen ti pampanunot yo wenno aniaman a cayat yo nga ibaga maipang-gep daguitoy a mait-ited a tulong. Ti nagan yo saan a ma-amuan ti sabsabali.

Adda sumagmamano a saludsud nga basaen mi cadacayo. Cadaguiti umuna a saludsud, ibaga yo no casano iti ricna yo babaen daguiti sumaruno a sungbat:

1) Saan-nac nga umayon a pulos 2) Saan-nac nga umayon 3) Saan co nga ammo wenno maibaga
4) Umayon-nac 5) mayon-nac amin

Mabalin yo iti agsaludsud maipang-gep ti aniaman a maibasa cadacayo. Saan cayo nga agam-amac.

[1] Ma-ayatanac ken capnecac iti isursuro ti pagadalan ti anac-co. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Ibaga yo no sapay:_____

_____

[2] Masapul nga amin a taga California macasa-o ti dua wenno ad-adupay a pagsasa-o. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Ibaga yo no sapay:_____

_____

Babaen ti linteg ditoy California maipang-gep ti pannangisuro ti dua a pagsasa-o (AB 1329, 1976), masapul nga amin amin a distritos ti pagadalan, ammoen da babaen ti census a tawen-tawen iti bilang daguiti agad-adal a saan nga macasa-o ti Ingles wenno saan unay a macasa-o ti Ingles. Cada maysa cadaquitoy nga agad-adal, masapul nga maisuro babaen ti pagsasa-o nga ma-awatanna. Daytoy a pannangisuro, cadua na ti pannagbigbig ti ug-ugali ken dadduma pay a paset ti cultura a nacairuaman ti agad-adal. Isasa-o met ti linteg a masapul iti pannakir-aman ti umili wenno cailian babaen ti comites nga taga ited ti balbal-lacad.

213

214

DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

[3] Ma-ayatanac ken capnecac daguiti isasa-o ti linteg. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Ibaga yo no sapay: _____

_____

[4] No iti cabaelan wenno pannacacayana, ma-ayatanac ken capnecac iti panag-gungun-od ti anac-co cadaguita clase na a mangus-usar ti dua a pagsasa-o (wenno ESL-Ingles a maicdua a pagsasa-o). 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Ibaga yo no sapay: _____

_____

[5] Ma-ayatanac ken capnecac iti pannangi-sursuro da iti anac-co dita clase a mangus-usar ti dua a pagsasa-o (wenno ESL). 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Ibaga yo no sapay: _____

_____

[6] Ma-ayatanac ken capnecac ti isursuro ti pagadalan maipang-gep ti ug ugali ken dadduma pay a paset ti cultura a nacairuaman mi. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Ibaga yo no sapay: _____

_____

[7] Ma-ayatanac ken capnecac ti pannakiraman ti umili wenno cailian ti programa a mangus-usar ti dua a pagsasa-o. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Ibaga yo no sapay: _____

_____

Cadaguiti mau-di a saludsud, ic-can cayo iti sumagmamano a pagpilian cada malpas ti saludsud. Ibaga yo ti piliyo.

159 DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

Dis___Sc___Pr___Gr___
Cl___Id___Ty___
INT___DATE_____

[8] Caycayatco nga ti anac-co, macaser-rec ken macapagadal idta clase nga mangus-usar ti dua a pagsasa-o:
1) Saan a pulos 2) maysa a tawen lang 3) Agin-ganat macapagsa-o a nala-ing ti Ingles
4) Agin-ganat macapasa-o a nala-ing ti Ingles ken_____ 5) Amin a 12 nga tawen

Ibaga yo no sapay: _____

_____

[9] Caycayatco nga daguiti clase ti anac-co ti pannangisuro: ***Icabil ti blanco ti pagsasa-o ti agad-adal.***

1) 100% Ingles 0%_____ 2) 75% Ingles 25%_____ 3) 50% Ingles 50%_____ 4) 25% Ingles 75%_____ 5) 0% Ingles 100%_____ 6 7

Ibaga yo no sapay: _____

_____

[10] Annia iti im-mununa a pagsasao nga nasursuro yo idi ubing cayo pay?

Ingles_____Dadduma_____

[11] ***No iti sungbat iti 10 ket saan nga Ingles:*** Us-usaren yo dayta a pagsasa-o

cada aldao_____, sagpaminsan _____, nga-ngani saan a pulos_____

[12] ***No iti pannagsaludsud ket Ingles, saan a masapul nga saludsudenen daytoy sumaruno a saludsud. Icabil ti wen ti blanco.*** Macasa-o cayo ti Ingles? Wen_____Saan_____

[13] Macasa-o cayo ti sabali pay a pagsasa-o. ***Inayon ti Ingles wenno ti pagsasa-o nga naibaga ti 10 no maibagay.***

Wen_____ Saan_____

160 DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

Dis___Sc___Pr___Gr___
Cl___Id___Ty___
INT_____DATE_____

英語の少しわかる人／英語のわからない人 質問書
（父母）

加州が英語の少しわかる生徒並びに全くわからない生徒のためのプログラムを研究するのにディブロップメントアソシエーツが手伝っています。その一部として皆さんの意見を必要としています。
貴方の名前は必要ありません。それ故自由にお答え下さい。

此処に質問があります。最初の質問には下記の如くお答え下さい。

1－全く反対　2－反対　3－きまらない　4－賛成　5－全く賛成

此等の質問に対してたずねたいことがありましたら自由にたずねて下さい。

(1) 学校が子供に教えてくれること、私は満足しています。　1 2 3 4 5 6 7

その理由を説明して下さい。_____

_____

(2) 加州に住んでいる人は二国語がそれ以上話せることが大事です。　1 2 3 4 5 6 7

その理由を説明して下さい。_____

_____

1976年に加州の二国語の教育法（AB1329）の中に英語を全く話せない生徒と少し話せる生徒の数を調査してその生徒達がわかる言葉で教えなければなりません。教育法はその生徒達の文化を認識していなくてはなりません。この法は又地域の協力並びに助言者員を必要としてます。

(3) 私はこの法に満足しています。　1 2 3 4 5 6 7

その理由を説明して下さい。_____

_____

_____

161 DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

(4) 子供の学力に対して二国語のクラスの進歩に満足しています。 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

その理由を説明して下さい。_____

_____

(5) 子供の二国語のクラスの教え方に満足しています。 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

その理由を説明して下さい。_____

_____

(6) 学校が私達の文化について教えて下さることに満足しています。 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

その理由を説明して下さい。_____

_____

(7) 私は二国語のプログラムに対する地域の協力に満足しています。 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

その理由を説明して下さい。_____

_____

次の質問は各々ちがった答えがついています。その中の一つを えらんで答えて下さい。

(8) 子供の二国語の更ク強する希望は：1ーいやです 2ー1年間だけ 3ー英語を完全に話せるまで 4ー英語と日本語と完全に話せるまで 5ー12年間の学校

その理由を説明して下さい。_____

_____

(9) 子供に次のように教えてほしいです。

1ー100% 英語 2ー75% 英語 3ー50% 英語 4ー25% 英語 5ー 0% 英語
0% 日本語 25% 日本語 50% 日本語 75% 日本語 100% 日本語

221

224

DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

Dis___Sc___Pr___Gr___
Cl___Id___Ty___
INT____DATE_____

その理由を説明して下さい。_____

_____

(10) 貴方は子供の時に最初ならった言葉は何語ですか。英語____ 日本語__ 他__

(11) 若しNo.10の質問の答が英語以外でしたら、その言葉を使うことは
毎日____ 時々____ ほとんど_____

(12) 若し面接が英語の場合この質問を必ずYESと記入して下さい。

(13) 日本語以外の国語を話せますか ハイ_____ イイエ_____

163 DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

Dis__ Sc__ Pr__ Gr__
Cl__ Id__ Ty__
INT__ DATE__

不會說英語或僅會說有限度英語而目前正接受英語訓練的學生家長意見調查表

PARENT

本社（Development Associates）為協助改善加州政府所提供的專為不會說英語或僅會說有限度英語人士學習英語的服務計劃，特舉辦此項意見調查。請您據實回答下列各項問題，但無需具名，回答時可圈選阿拉伯數字 1 2 3 4 5 以代表您不同程度的意見。

1 表示完全不同意。
2 表示不同意。
3 表示不能決定
4 表示同意。
5 表示完全同意。

請回答下列問題，如有不明瞭之處請提出詢問

〔1〕我对學校給我子女的教育目前感滿意。

1 2 3 4 5

請解釋原因 _____

_____

_____

〔2〕每一個加州居民應會說兩種以上語言，我認為這是很重要的

1 2 3 4 5

請解釋 _____

_____

_____

一九七六年加州通过双重語言双重文化法案（AB 1329）規定加州各地方教育学区在每年例行調查统計不會說英語及僅會說有限度英語的学生人數，並為顧及上述学生的文化背景，在使用学生本身能够明瞭的母語施教。該法案同时規定設置諮詢委員會，要求社区共同參予。

〔3〕我对加州双重語言，双重文化法案的條款尚覺滿意。

1 2 3 4 5

請解釋 _____

_____

_____

〔4〕就子女本身能力衡量，我認為我子女在双語班或在學習英語為第二語言班的學業成績尚堪告慰。

1 2 3 4 5

Chinese/Parent: p. 2

Dis___ Sc___ Pr___ Gr___
Cl___ Id___ Ty___
INT___ DATE___

請解釋 _____
_____
_____

〔5〕我对子女在双語班或在学習英語为
第二語言班中的施教方式示感滿意
1 2 3 4 5
請解釋 _____
_____
_____

〔6〕我对学校在日常教学中注意提及学生
本身文化深感滿意
1 2 3 4 5
請解釋 _____
_____
_____

〔7〕我对双語計劃中包括社区人士参予
覺得滿意
1 2 3 4 5
請解釋 _____
_____
_____

在下列最後幾項問題中，本社希望
您在適当的答案中圈選一項.

〔8〕我願我的子女進入双語班或進入學習英語為第二語言班

1 完全不要
2 最多一到
3 直到會說好英語為止
4 直到會說好英語及 _____
5 一直到十二年級高中畢業

請解釋原因 _____

_____

_____

〔9〕我願我子女上課时，老师用 _____ (請在空格內填入何种語言) 教書

1 100% 英語
0% _____
2 75% 英語
25% _____
3 50% 英語
50% _____
4 25% 英語
75% _____
5 0% 英語
100% _____

請解釋 _____

_____

_____

〔10〕 請問你的母語是什么？

英語 _____ 或 _____

〔11〕 如果你的母語不是英語，那么你現在是否仍每天 _____ 偶而 _____ 或從不 _____ 使用母語談話

〔12〕 你會不會說英語？

會 _____

不會 _____

〔13〕 除英語外，你還會說何种語言？

_____

_____

Dis___ Sc___ Pr___ Gr___

Cl___ Id___ Ty___

INT___ DATE___

Chinese/Parent: p. 5

Dis___Sc___Pr___Gr___
Cl___Id___Ty___

INT___DATE____

LES/NES SERVICES OPINIONNAIRE
(Community)

Development Associates is helping the State of California conduct a study of its services to limited and non-English speaking students. As a part of that study, it is important that we obtain your opinions about those services. Your name will not be used so you can answer without anyone knowing what you said.

We have several statements we will read to you. On the first few, please indicate how you feel about the statement with one of the following replies:

1-totally disagree, 2-disagree, 3-neither agree nor disagree, 4-agree, 5-totally agree

Please feel free to ask any question you wish about a statement.

[1] I am satisfied with what the school is teaching the children. *1 2 3 4 5 6 7*

Please explain your reason:_____

_____

[2] It is important that Californians speak two or more languages. *1 2 3 4 5 6 7*

Please explain:_____

_____

The California Bilingual Bicultural Education Act of 1976 (AB 1329) provides that all school districts conduct a census of the number of limited and non-English speaking pupils (LES/NES) annually and that each LES/NES pupil must receive instruction in a language understandable to the pupil. Instruction must recognize the culture of the pupils. The law also requires community participation through advisory committees.

[3] I am satisfied with the provisions of the Bilingual Bicultural Education Act. *1 2 3 4 5 6 7*

Please explain:_____

_____

_____

230

231

169 DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

[4] Considering the group as a whole, I am satisfied with the children's progress in the bilingual [or ESL] classes. *1 2 3 4 5 6 7*

Please explain: _____

_____

[5] I am satisfied with the way the children's bilingual [or ESL] classes are being taught. *1 2 3 4 5 6 7*

Please explain: _____

_____

[6] I am satisfied with what the school is teaching about our cultures. *1 2 3 4 5 6 7*

Please explain: _____

_____

[7] I am satisfied with the community participation in the bilingual program. *1 2 3 4 5 6 7*

Please explain: _____

_____

On these last questions, I will give you some different choices after asking each question. Please choose the one you prefer.

[8] I prefer that the children be enrolled in bilingual [or ESL] classes: 1-not at all, 2-only one year, 3-until fluent in English, 4-until fluent in English and their primary language, 5-all 12 years of school.

Please explain: _____

_____

[9] I prefer that the children's classes be taught:
1-100% in English 2-75% English 3-50% English 4-25% English 5- 0% English *6 7*
0% in their primary language 25% primary language 50% primary language 75% primary language 100% primary language

Dis___Sc___Pr___Gr___
Cl___Id___Ty___
INT____DATE_____

MGA PALATANUNGAN UKOL SA TULONG NA GINAGAWA PARA SA
MGA MAY KAUNTING KAALAMAN SA PAGSASALITA NG INGLES/HINDI
MAKAPAGSALITA NG INGLES (LES/NES)

(Pampurok)

Ang SAMAHANG PAGPAPAUNLAD (Development Associates) ay tumutulong sa Estado ng California na mapag-aralan ang ukol sa tulong na ginagawa nito para sa mga mag-aaral na hindi makapagsalita ng wikang Ingles. Bilang bahagi ng pag-aaral na ito, kailangan ang inyong mga kuro-kuro ukol sa mga tulong na ginagawang ito. Kayo ay malayang makasasagot sa mga katanungan sapagkat hindi mababanggit ang inyong pangalan.

Mayroong ilang pangungusap na babasahin sa inyo. Sa ilang nauuna, pakilagay ang inyong damdamin sa pangungusap sa pamamagitan ng isa sa mga sumusunod na kasagutan:

1-Salungat na salungat ako, 2-Salungat ako, 3-Marahil, 4-Sumasang-ayon
5-Sinasang-ayunang lahat

Malaya kayong makapagtatanong ng tungkol sa mga pangungusap.

[1] Ako'y nasisiyahan sa ginagawang pagtuturo ng paaralan sa mga bata. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Pakipaliwanag_____

_____

[2] Mahalaga sa bawat taga-California na makapagsalita ng dalawa o higit pa sa dalawang wika. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Pakipaliwanag_____

_____

Ang batas ukol sa Aralang Dalwika/Dal-linang (Bilingual/Bicultural Education) ng taong 1976 ng California (AB 1329) ay nagsasaad na kailangang malaman ng bawat purok paaralan ang bilang ng mga batang nag-aaral taon-taon na hindi makapagsalita ng Ingles at ang bawat batang ito ay dapat turuan sa wikang naliliwanagan ng mag-aaral. Sa pagtuturong ito ay kailangang malaman ang kalinangan ng mga mag-aaral. Ang batas ay nangangailangan ng pakikisama ng purok sa pamamagitan ng mga lupong tagapayo.

171 DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

Please explain: _____

_____

[10] What was the first language you learned as a child? *English__Other:*_____

[11] *If the answer to 10 was other than English:* Do you speak that language daily__, occasionally__, almost never__.

[12] *If the interview is in English, do not ask this question and mark YES for the answer:* Do you speak English? *Yes__No__*

[13] Do you speak any other language [*add...in addition to English if applicable and the language listed in 10 if applicable*]? *Yes__No__*

[3] Ako'y nasisiyahan sa mga nilalaman ng batas sa Aralang Dalwika/ Dal-linang. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Pakipaliwanag_____

_____

[4] Batay sa kakayahan ng buong pangkat, ako'y nasisiyahan sa kanilang kaunlaran sa klaseng dalwika (o Ingles bilang pangalawang wika). 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Pakipaliwanag_____

_____

[5] Ako'y nasisiyahan sa ginagawang pamamaraan ng pagtuturo sa mga klaseng dalwika (o Ingles bilang pangalawang wika). 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Pakipaliwanag_____

_____

[6] Ako'y nasisiyahan sa ginagawang pagtuturo ng paaralan ukol sa aming kalinangan. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Pakipaliwanag_____

_____

[7] Ako'y nasisyahan sa pakikipagtulungan ng purok sa palatuntunang dalwika. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Pakipaliwanag _____

_____

173 DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

Dis___Sc___Pr___Gr___

INT____DATE_____

Sa mga huling katanungan, bibigyan ko kayo ng iba't-ibang mapagpipiliang kasagutan pagkatapos ng bawat tanong. Piliin ang inyong kasagutan.

[8] Nais kong ang mga bata ay makapag-aral sa klaseng dalwika (o Ingles bilang pangalawang wika). 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

1) hindi na bale 2) 1 taon 3) hanggang matutuhan ang wikang Ingles
4) hanggang matutuhan ang wikang Ingles at _____ 5) sa lahat ng 12 baytang

Pakipaliwanag_____

_____

[9] Nais kong ang mga bata ay maturuan ng: (Ilagay ang nais na wika sa puwang)

1) 100% Ingles 2) 75% Ingles 3) 50% Ingles 4) 25% Ingles 5) 0% Ingles
0%_____ 25%_____ 50%_____ 75%_____ 100%_____

Pakipaliwanag_____

_____

[10] Ano ang unang wika na natutuhan ninyo noong kayo ay bata pa? Ingles_____Iba_____

[11] *Kung ang kasagutan sa tanong bilang 10 ay iba sa wikang Ingles:* Sinasalita ba ninyo itong wikang ito araw-araw_____, paminsan-minsan_____, halos hindi kailanman_____.

[12] *Kung ang pakikipanayam ay sa Ingles, huwag na itong itanong at ilagay ang Oo bilang kasagutan:* Kayo ba ay nagsasalita ng Ingles? Oo_____ Hindi_____

[13] Nagsasalita ba kayo ng ibang wika? *Idagdag . . . bukod sa Ingles kung nararapat at ang wikang nasasaad sa 10 kung kailangan.* Oo_____Hindi_____

DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

Dis___Sc___Pr___Gr___
Cl___Id___Ty___
INT___DATE_____

SALUDSUD MAIPANG-GEP ITI MAIT-ITED A TULONG
CADAGUITI SAAN A MACAPAGSA-O TI INGLES WENNO
SAAN UNAY A MACAPAGSA-O TI INGLES

(Para cadaguiti ca-aduan wenno umili)

Iti DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES tultulongan na iti estado ti California nga adalen ti mait-ited a tulong cadaguiti agad-adal a saan nga macasa-o ti Ingles. Cadua daytoy a pannagadal, masapul nga ammoen ti pampanunot yo wenno aniaman a cayat yo nga ibaga maipang-gep daguitoy a maitited a tulong. Ti nagan yo saan a ma-amuan ti sabsabali.

Adda sumgmamano a saludsud nga basaen mi dacadayo. Cadaguiti umuna a saludsud, ibaga yo no casano iti ricna yo babaen daguiti sumaruno a sungbat:

1) Saan-nac nga umayon a pulos 2) Saan-nac nga umayon 3) Saan co nga ammo wenno maibaga
4) Umayon-nac 5) Umayon-nac amin

Mabalin yo iti agsaludsud maipang-gep ti aniaman a maibasa cadacayo. Saan cayo nga agam-amac.

[1] Ma-ayatanac ken capnecac iti isursuro ti pagadalan cadaguiti agad-adal a ub-ubing. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Ibaga yo no sapay: _____

_____

[2] Masapul nga amin a taga California macasa-o ti dua wenno ad-adupay a pagsasa-o. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Ibaga yo no sapay: _____

_____

Babaen ti linteg ditoy California maipang-gep ti pannangisuro ti dua a pagsasa-o (AB 1329, 1976), masapul nga amin amin a distritos ti pagadalan, ammoen da babaen ti census a tawen-tawen iti bilang daguiti agad-adal a saan nga macasa-o ti Ingles wenno saan unay a macasa-o ti Ingles. Cada maysa cadaquitoy nga agad-adal, masapul nga maisuro babaen ti pagsasa-o nga ma-awatanna. Daytoy a pannangisuro, cadua na ti pannagbigbig ti ug-ugali ken dadduma pay

175 DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

a paset ti cultura a nacairuaman ti agad-adal. Isasa-o met ti linteg a masapul iti pannakiraman ti umili wenno cailian babaen ti comites nga taga ited ti balbal-lacad.

[3] Ma-ayatanac ken capnecac daguiti isasa-o ti linteg. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Ibaga yo no sapay: _____

_____

[4] No iti cabaelan wenno pannacacayada, a cas maymaysa a grupo, ma-ayatanac ken capnecac iti panag-gungun-od daguiti agad-adal cadaguita clase a mangus-usar ti dua a pagsasa-o (wenno ESL-Ingles a maicadua a pagsasa-o). 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Ibaga yo no sapay: _____

_____

[5] Ma-ayatanac ken capnecac iti pannangi-sursuro da cadaguiti agad-adal dita clase a mangus-usar ti dua a pagsasa-o (wenno ESL). 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Ibaga yo no sapay: _____

_____

[6] Ma-ayatanac ken capnecac ti isursuro ti pagadalan maipang-gep ti ug-ugali ken dadduma pay a paset ti cultura a nacairuaman mi. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Ibaga yo no sapay: _____

_____

[7] Ma-ayatanac ken capnecac ti pannakiraman ti umili wenno cailian ti programa a mangus-usar ti dua a pagsasa-o. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Ibaga yo no sapay: _____

_____

DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

Dis___Sc___Pr___Gr___
Cl___Id___Ty___
INT____DATE_____

Cadaguiti mau-di a saludsud, ic-can cayo iti sumagmamano a pagpilian cada malpas ti saludsud. Ibaga yo ti piliyo.

[8] Caycayatco nga daguiti ub-ubing, macaser-rec ken macapagadal ta clase nga mangus-usar ti dua a pagsasa-o:

1) Saan a pulos 2) maysa a tawen lang 3) Agin-ganat macapagsa-o a nala-ing ti Ingles
4) Agin-ganat macapasa-o a nala-ing ti Ingles ken_____ 5) Amin a 12 nga tawen

Ibaga yo no sapay: _____

_____

[9] Caycayatco nga daguiti clase ti ub-ubing, ti pannangisuro: *Icabil ti blanco ti pagsasa-o ti agad-adal.*

1) 100% Ingles 0%_____ 2) 75% Ingles 25%_____ 3) 50% Ingles 50%_____ 4) 25% Ingles 75%_____ 5) 0% Ingles 100%_____ 6 7

Ibaga yo no sapay: _____

_____

[10] Annia iti im-mununa a pagsasao nga nasursuro yo idi ubing cayo pay?

Ingles_____Dadduma_____

[11] *No iti sungbat iti 10 ket saan nga Ingles:* Us-usaren yo dayta a pagsasa-o cada aldao_____, sagpaminsan _____, nga-ngani saan a pulos_____

[12] *No iti pannagsaludsud ket Ingles, saan a masapul nga saludsudenen daytoy sumaruno a saludsud. Icabil ti wen ti blanco.* Macasa-o cayo ti Ingles? Wen_____Saan_____

[13] Macasa-o cayo ti sabali pay a pagsasa-o. *Inayon ti Ingles wenno ti pagsasa-o nga naibaga ti 10 no maibagay.*

Wen_____Saan_____

Dis___Sc___Pr___Gr___

Cl___Id___Ty___

INT_____DATE_____

LES/NES SERVICES OPINIONNAIRE
(Staff)

Development Associates is helping the State of California conduct a study of its services to limited and non-English speaking students. As a part of that study, it is important that we obtain your opinions about those services. Your name will not be used so you can answer without anyone knowing what you said.

We have several statements we will read to you. On the first few, please indicate how you feel about the statement with one of the following replies:

1-totally disagree, 2-disagree, 3-neither agree nor disagree, 4-agree, 5-totally agree

Please feel free to ask any question you wish about a statement.

[1] I am satisfied with what the school is teaching the children. *1 2 3 4 5 6 7*

Please explain your reason:_____

_____

[2] It is important that Californians speak two or more languages. *1 2 3 4 5 6 7*

Please explain:_____

_____

The California Bilingual Bicultural Education Act of 1976 (AB 1329) provides that all school districts conduct a census of the number of limited and non-English speaking pupils (LES/NES) annually and that each LES/NES pupil must receive instruction in a language understandable to the pupil. Instruction must recognize the culture of the pupils. The law also requires community participation through advisory committees.

[3] I am satisfied with the provisions of the Bilingual Bicultural Education Act. *1 2 3 4 5 6 7*

Please explain:_____

_____

_____

213

DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

[4] Considering the group as a whole, I am satisfied with the children's progress in the bilingual [or ESL] classes. *1 2 3 4 5 6 7*

Please explain: _____

_____

[5] I am satisfied with the way the children's bilingual [or ESL] classes are being taught. *1 2 3 4 5 6 7*

Please explain: _____

_____

[6] I am satisfied with what the school is teaching about our cultures. *1 2 3 4 5 6 7*

Please explain: _____

_____

[7] I am satisfied with the community participation in the bilingual program. *1 2 3 4 5 6 7*

Please explain: _____

_____

On these last questions, I will give you some different choices after asking each question. Please choose the one you prefer.

[8] I prefer that the children be enrolled in bilingual [or ESL] classes: 1-not at all, 2-only one year, 3-until fluent in English, 4-until fluent in English and their primary language, 5-all 12 years of school.

Please explain: _____

_____

[9] I prefer that the children's classes be taught:
1-100% in English 2-75% English 3-50% English 4-25% English 5- 0% English *6 7*
0% in their primary language 25% primary language 50% primary language 75% primary language 100% primary language

DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

Dis___Sc___Pr___Gr___
Cl___Id___Ty___
INT___DATE_____

Please explain: _____

_____

[10] What was the first language you learned as a child? *English*__*Other:*_____

[11] *If the answer to 10 was other than English:* Do you speak that language daily__, occasionally__, almost never__.

[12] *If the interview is in English, do not ask this question and mark YES for the answer:* Do you speak English? *Yes*__*No*__

[13] Do you speak any other language [*add...in addition to English if applicable and the language listed in 10 if applicable*]? *Yes*__*No*__

Dis___Sc___Pr___Gr___
Cl___Id___Ty___

INT___DATE_____

MGA PALATANUNGAN UKOL SA TULONG NA GINAGAWA PARA SA MGA MAY KAUNTING KAALAMAN SA PAGSASALITA NG INGLES/HINDI MAKAPAGSALITA NG INGLES (LES/NES)

(Para sa mga Kawani)

Ang SAMAHANG PAGPAPAUNLAD (Development Associates) ay tumutulong sa Estado ng California na mapag-aralan ang ukol sa tulong na ginagawa nito para sa mga mag-aaral na hindi maka-pagsalita ng wikang Ingles. Bilang bahagi ng pag-aaral na ito, kailangan ang inyong mga kuro-kuro ukol sa mga tulong na ginagawang ito. Kayo ay malayang makasasagot sa mga katanungan sapagkat hindi mababanggit ang inyong pangalan.

Mayroong ilang pangungusap na babasahin sa inyo. Sa ilang nauuna, pakilagay ang inyong damdamin sa pangungusap sa pamamagitan ng isa sa mga sumusunod na kasagutan:

1) Salungat na salungat ako 2) Salungat ako 3) Marahil 4) Sumasang-ayon 5) Sinasang-ayunang lahat

Malaya kyong makapagtatanong ng tungkol sa mga pangungusap.

[1] Ako'y nasisiyahan sa ginagawang pagtuturo ng paaralan sa mga bata. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Pakipaliwanag _____

_____

[2] Mahalaga sa bawat taga California na makapagsalita ng dalawa o higit pa sa dalawang wika. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Pakipaliwanag _____

_____

Ang batas ukol sa Aralang Dalwika/Dal-linang (Bilingual/Bicultural Education) ng taong 1976 ng California (AB 1329) ay nagsasaad na kailangang malaman ng bawat purok paaralan ang bilang ng mga batang nag-aaral taon-taon na hindi makapagsalita ng Ingles at ang bawat batang ito ay dapat turuan sa wikang naliliwanagan ng mag-aaral. Sa pagtuturong ito ay kailangang malaman ang kalinangan ng mga mag-aaral. Ang batas ay nangangailangan ng pakikisama ng purok sa pamamagitan ng mga lupong tagapayo.

255

254

181 DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

[3] Ako'y nasisiyanan sa mga nilalaman ng batas sa Aral Dalwika/ Dal-linang. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Pakipaliwanag _____

_____

[4] Batay sa kakayahan ng buong pangkat, ako'y nasisiyahan sa kanilang kaunlaran sa klaseng dalwika (o Ingles bilang pangalawang wika). 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Pakipaliwanag _____

_____

[5] Ako'y nasisiyahan sa ginagawang pagtuturo ng paaralan ukol sa aming kalinangan. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Pakipaliwanag _____

_____

[6] Ako'y nasisiyahan sa ginagawang pagtuturo ng paaralan ukol sa aming kalinangan. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Pakipaliwanag _____

_____

[7] Ako'y nasisiyahan sa pakikipagtulungan ng purok sa palatuntunang dalwika. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Pakipaliwanag _____

_____

Dis___Sc___Pr___Gr___
Cl___Id___Ty___
INT___DATE_____

Sa mga huling katanungan bibigyan ko kayo ng ibat-ibang mapagpipiliang kasagutan pagkatapos ng bawat tanong. Piliin ang inyong kasagutan.

[8] Nais kong ang mga bata ay makapag-aral sa klaseng dalwika (o Ingles bilang pangalawang wika).

1) hindi na bale 2) 1 taon 3) hanggang matutuhan ang wikang Ingles
4) Hanggang matutuhan ang wikang Ingles at _____ 5) sa lahat ng 12 baytang

[9] Nais kong ang mga bata ay maturuan ng:

1) 100% Ingles 0% sa kanilang wika	2) 75% Ingles 25% kanilang wika	3) 50% Ingles 50% kanilang wika	4) 25% Ingles 75% kanilang wika	5) 0% Ingles 100% kanilang wika

[10] Ano ang unang wika na natutuhan ninyo noong kayo ay bata pa? Ingles_____Iba_____

[11] *Kung ang kasagutan sa tanong bilang 10 ay iba sa wikang Ingles:* Sinasalita ba ninyo itong wikang ito araw-araw_____paminsan-minsan _____halos hindi kailanman_____.

[12] *Kung ang pakikipanayam ay sa Ingles, huwag na itong itanong at ilagay ang Oo bilang kasagutan:* Kayo ba ay nagsasalita ng Ingles? Oo_____Hindi_____

[13] Nagsasalita ba kayo ng ibang wika? *Idagdag . . . bukod sa Ingles kung nararapat at ang wikang nasasaad sa 10 kung kailangan.* Oo_____ Hindi_____.

253

258

DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

FINANCE STUDY GUIDES

The finance substudy focused on two types of data: data from the district and school offices, and supplemental case studies. Information about budgeted line items was easily obtained, although aggregations across some instructional programs were encountered. Expenditures, however, were not specified in the required accounting procedures and those occasioned many problems.

Some of the sections of the guides functioned well and may be considered useful in other studies. In each case, however, researchers are urged to explore the data and their sources carefully before producing finance study guides. Without that procedure, little of consequence will be achieved.

The instruments presented were useful in the present study. The specification of funds and funding sources was especially helpful. That detailed preparation made the conduct of the research much more practical then it otherwise would have been.

FINANCIAL RESOURCES GUIDE
(District)

This interview is to be administered to the chief administrator of the district or a designate(s). This interview is intended to gather district level information about the state, federal and local funding sources used to provide instructional services to LES/NES students, the types of services provided through each of these funding sources, and the relationship of these instructional services to the identified needs of the LES/NES students. Information is to be gathered about the district's system for planning the allocation of these funds to the schools and the process used to make these resource allocation decisions. The effects of changes in state laws and/or state funding procedures on the district's services to LES/NES students will be investigated. More specific information will be gathered through interviews with the principals and bilingual coordinators via the School Site Interview Guide.

Part of the California LES/NES Study calls for an examination of the nature and extent of financial resources supporting instructional services to LES/NES students. This interview is intended to identify the main funding sources used by your district to support bilingual instruction.

District _____ Code _____

City _____ County _____

Chief Bilingual/ESL Program Administrator: Name _____

Title _____ Office Location _____

Phone ( ) _____

If interviewee is other than chief administrator:

Name _____ Title _____

Office Location _____ Phone ( ) _____

Other persons providing information for this guide:

Name _____ Title _____

Name _____ Title _____

1. Please indicate the funding sources that have been or are being used by the district to support instructional services for LES/NES students for the following academic years.

	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80
SB1641			
SB90			
AB1329			
School Improvement Program			
AB2284			
Miller-Unruh			
ESEA Title IV-B			
ESEA Title VII			
ESAA			
Title I Regular			
Title I Migrant			
Federal Vocational Education			
Compensatory Education			
Local Funds			
Other (Specifiy)			

2. Can we obtain a copy of the district's annual budget for the 1979-1980 school year? *If budget not readily available, ask where you can get a copy.* ___

Show the chief administrator the list of the sample schools in that district.

3. Does the district's annual budget include a breakdown of the state and federal funds allocated to the sample schools to support instructional services to LES/NES students? Yes___ No ___

   If no, are estimates available as to these allocations? *Estimates would include planned allocations for teacher salaries, teacher aide salaries, special materials, inservice and other staff development, testing and assessment, equipment.*

   If estimates are not available from district, ascertain if this information will be available from the school principals.

4. How are the instructional needs of LES and NES students identified by the district?

5. What are the most important instructional needs of the LES and NES students in this district? Explain.

6. Of these instructional needs, are there any that are not adequately being met by the available financial resources?_____

7. Does the district prepare a program plan, by funding source, describing the manner in which these funds are to be used and the services that will be provided to LES/NES students? Yes___ No___

   If Yes, can we obtain a copy of these plans? *If plans are voluminous, ask to review the plans and note the services specified for each funding source.*

   If answer to 7 is no, How are services to LES/NES students related to the various funding sources?_____

8. What process or steps does the district generally use in deciding which schools will receive state or federal funds for services to LES/NES students, the amount that will be allocated to these schools, and the services that will be provided? *Inquire about the main actors in the planning, input from the school principals, criteria used to allocate funds to schools, centralized vs decentralized planning and role of school advisory councils.*_____

9. What is the estimated per pupil cost in this district for providing instructional services to LES and NES students? *If an estimate is provided, inquire as to how the per pupil cost is computed.*

   If estimate provided, Do per pupil costs vary across the sample schools in the district? Yes___ No___

   If Yes, what is the estimated per pupil in each of the sample schools? *Use sample school list to record information.*

   1. _____
   2. _____
   3. _____
   4. _____

   What factors tend to contribute to differences in per pupil costs? *For each factor noted, ask for explanation.*

Teacher salaries ☐ _____

Size of LES/NES population ☐ _____

263

Staff Development ☐ _____

Materials & Equipment ☐ _____

Years Program in Operation ☐ _____

Funding/Program Requirements ☐ _____

Grades Served ☐ _____

Language Group Served ☐ _____

Other (specify) ☐ _____

10. Did Proposition 13 affect the provision of services to LES and NES pupils in this district? Yes___ No___

If yes, what were the specific effects?_____

_____

_____

_____

11. Have there been any changes in legislation and/or state funding practices (other than Proposition 13) that have affected the amount of funds available for services to LES/NES students? Yes___ No___

If yes, please describe the nature of the changes, approximately when they occurred, and their impacts on the district's services.

Change	Time Period	Impacts

12. Are there any comments you wish to make about the financing of instructional services for LES/NES students not covered earlier in this interview?

_____

_____

_____

Note: Before concluding interview, check that you have obtained copies and/or made notes on the district's annual budget, allocation of funds to sample schools, distribution of costs by school, and program plans for provision of services to LES/NES students. If any of these are missing, note where they will be obtained and from whom.

264

FINANCIAL RESOURCES GUIDE
(School Site)

This guide is to be completed through an interview with the principal of each sample school, and where appropriate, should also include the bilingual education coordinator. The purposes of this guide are to gather specific information about the allocation of funds made to each sample school to provide instructional services to LES/NES students, how these funds are being used, and the specific services that are being provided. In addition, the guide is intended to examine the role of the principal and school advisory committee in planning the expenditure of funds.

Part of the California LES/NES Study includes the examination at the school level of the financial resources supporting instructional services to LES and NES students. This interview is intended mainly to identify the main funding sources used by this school, the specific instructional services that are being provided via each source, and the general manner in which these funds are expended.

District_____ Code_____ School Code _____

City_____ School_____

Principal's Name _____ Phone ( )_____

Please indicate the names and titles of other school personnel who assisted in the completion of this interview.

Name _____ Title_____

Name_____ Title_____

Name_____ Title_____

1. How many LES and NES students are enrolled in this school for the 1979-1980 year? Please show enrollment by grade.

	LES	NES	TOTAL
K			
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			

	LES	NES	TOTAL
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			

2. Please indicate the specific funding sources that have been used by this school for the following academic years:

	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80
SB1641			
SB90			
AB1329			
School Improvement Program			
AB2284			
Miller-Unruh			
ESEA Title IV-B			
ESEA Title VII			
ESAA			
Title I Regular			
Title I Migrant			
Federal Vocational Education			
Compensatory Education			
Local Funds			
Other (Specifiy)			

A School Site Financial Resources form is to be completed for each funding source used by the school in the 1979-80 academic year.

3. What procedures are to be used to determine the instructional needs of the LES and NES students in this school?_____

4. In your estimation, what are the most important LES/NES instructional needs in this school?

a._____
b._____
c._____
d._____

5. Which of these LES/NES needs are not adequately being served by available financial resources? Specify:_____

6. What additional financial resources would be needed to adequately meet these needs? _____

266

7. Is there a school plan that describes the needs of the LES/NES students for the 1979-80 academic year? Yes____ No____

   If yes, may we have a copy of that school plan?

8. Does the school prepare program plans that describe the services that are to be provided to LES/NES students via the various funding sources from the state, e.g., EDY, Economic Impact Aid, and other sources?

   Yes____ No____

   If yes, may we have a copy of that school plan?

   How are services and expenditures for the various state bilingual funding sources planned at the school level?_____

9. At what level are the following types of decisions typically made?

	District Office	School Principal	School Site Council
. Identification of LES/NES needs	_____	_____	_____
. Prioritization of LES/NES needs	_____	_____	_____
. Allocation of state bilingual education funds to school	_____	_____	_____
. Planning expenditures of bilingual funds at school	_____	_____	_____
. Actual expenditures of bilingual funds at school	_____	_____	_____

10. Once funds have been allocated to the school for services to LES/NES students, what is the role of the principal in deciding where these funds are used (e.g., employment of teachers or aides, special materials, equipment, curriculum materials)? _____

11. In terms of the expenditure of these funds, what types of decisions on the part of the principal require the concurrence of the district office?

12. What criteria are generally applied by the district in determining the amounts to be allocated to the school for services to LES/NES students?
    a. _____
    b. _____
    c. _____
    d. _____

13. As you know, the Economic Impact Aid provisions of AB65 now incorporate the funds originally channeled through AB1329, AB2284 and SB1641. Obviously this represents an important change in the state funding procedures. What effect has this change had on the allocation of state bilingual funds to this school? _____

14. What effects did Proposition 13 have on the provision of services to LES/NES students in this school? _____

15. Are there any additional comments you would like to make about the financing of instructional services to LES/NES students? _____

School Site Financial Resources

Funding Source Analysis

Complete a separate form for each state or federal funding source used by the school to support instructional services for LES/NES students during the 1979-1980 academic year. Although certain sets of information may be identical for two or more funding sources, all of the information is to be included for each funding source. Specify if these are Economic Impact Aid funds.

School Code _____ Funding Source _____

Amount Allocated _____ No. of Years Source Used _____

Program Designation _____

Circle grades served with these funds. Indicate LES, NES and FES students served by grade.

	LES/NES	FES	TOTAL		LES/NES	FES	TOTAL
K				6			
1				7			
2				8			
3				9			
4				10			
5				11			
				12			

Please describe the instructional services provided through this specific funding source.

A. _____
B. _____
C. _____
D. _____
E. _____

In terms of this funding source, please indicate the planned expenditure of funds for the 1979-1980 academic year.

Employment of Bilingual Teachers	$_____
Employment of Bilingual Teacher Aides	_____
Employment of Counselors	_____
Employment of Supervisory Personnel	_____
Central Administration	_____
Purchase Special Bilingual Teaching Materials	_____
Special In Service/Staff Development	_____
Expenses for Parent Advisory Groups	_____

Planned expenditure of funds for the 1979-1980 academic year (continued from the previous page).

Purchase of Special Equipment for Bilingual Education	_____
Field Trips	_____
Utilities/Housekeeping	_____
Contracts, Rents & Leases	_____
InterProgram Charges & Credits	_____
Indirect Costs	_____
Assessment & Reporting	_____
Evaluation	_____
Other (specify) _____	_____
Total Planned Expenditures (total of both pages)	$_____

Can you provide information about the actual expenditures made in this school for the specific funding source during the 1978-1979 academic year:
Yes_____ No _____

If yes, may we have a copy of that expenditures report?

If no, where can we get this information? _____
_____